

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

VOLUME 1

JANUARY 1954

NUMBER 3

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

Challenges to the Freedom of Social Scientists	JOSEPH B. GITTLER, EZRA W. GEDDES, ODIN W. ANDERSON, THOMAS L. BLAIR, FRANZ ADLER, ALBERT D. ULLMAN, THOMAS D. ELIOT	77
The Social Responsibility of the Social Scientist	ARNOLD M. ROSE	85
The Dangers of Project Research	HAROLD W. DODDS	90
Pressures Upon Research and Publication	MABEL A. ELLIOTT	94
The Publicly Employed Sociologist	CARROLL D. CLARK	98
The Choice of Research Projects	S. M. MILLER	100
• • • • •		
The Costs of Segregated Schools	STUART A. QUEEN, MARY F. P. RUSSELL, VERNON POHLMANN	102
Description in Social Problems Texts	ABBOTT P. HERMAN	105

BOOK REVIEWS

W. F. White Robert Bierstedt Louis Schneider Israel Gerver

OFFICIAL REPORTS

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY FOR
THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Official Journal of the Society for the Study of Social Problems

JEROME HIMELHOCH, *Editor*
SIDNEY H. ARONSON, *Associate Editor*
SYLVIA FLEIS FAVA, *Associate Editor*
NATHAN L. GERRARD, *Associate Editor*
SAMUEL KOENIG, *Book Review Editor*

ADVISORY EDITORS

HOWARD BECKER, *University of Wisconsin*
E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER, *Howard University*
JOHN P. GILLIN, *University of North Carolina*
A. IRVING HALLOWELL, *University of Pennsylvania*
OTTO KLINEBERG, *Columbia University*
CLYDE KLUCKHOHN, *Harvard University*
MAX LERNER, *Brandeis University*
ABRAHAM H. MASLOW, *Brandeis University*
FRANCIS E. MERRILL, *Dartmouth College*
ROBERT K. MERTON, *Columbia University*
ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., *Cornell University*

EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

HORNELL HART, *Duke University*
SAMUEL KOENIG, *Brooklyn College*
ELIZABETH BRIANT LEE, *Connecticut College for Women*
ARNOLD M. ROSE, *University of Minnesota*
LOWRY NELSON, *Chairman, University of Minnesota*

SOCIAL PROBLEMS is published quarterly by the Society for the Study of Social Problems. Membership dues of the Society, including subscription, are \$5.00 per year for Active and Associate members; \$6.00 for Joint members; and \$3.00 for Student members. Subscription rate for non-members, \$4.00. Single issues, \$1.00.

Manuscripts and communications for the editor should be addressed to the Editor, **SOCIAL PROBLEMS**, Brandeis University, Waltham 57, Mass. Business correspondence should be mailed to the Advertising Manager or the Business Manager, **SOCIAL PROBLEMS**, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn 10, N.Y. Authors are requested to send two double-spaced typed copies (an original and a carbon) of their manuscripts, which ordinarily should not exceed 3,500 words. Applications for permission to quote from this Journal should be addressed to the Editor. Subscribers who change their address should notify this Journal and their local postmaster immediately.

(Copyrighted 1953 by the Society for the Study of Social Problems)

GL
Pulich
5558

2-110223

A SYMPOSIUM ON CHALLENGES TO THE FREEDOM OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS*

I.

JOSEPH B. GITTLER

Iowa State College

Scribes, theologians, philosophers, men in all walks of life have carried on acrimonious debate on the meaning of freedom in almost all societies. The varied and uncertain meaning of the term requires an adequate definition for the purposes of this discussion. We shall use freedom as the *absence of constraints to achieve desirable ends*, or as Bertrand Russell so aptly states it: "The absence of obstacles to the realization of desires." (1)

Three words are obviously significant in this definition: *constraints, desirable, ends*. In the absence of either a general consensus as to just what these words symbolize or valid empirical data upon which we can adequately describe their attributes, we are forced to list a basic minimum of characteristics which we judge most social scientists can accept without violating their personal norms and values or those of the profession.

These are, of course, merely tentative and are stated for the purpose of furthering discussion. Here, then, are some of the *desirable ends*:

1. To choose one's own problem for investigation.
2. To conduct research in the manner

*A revised version of the panel discussion, CHALLENGES TO THE FREEDOM OF SOCIOLOGISTS, conducted at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems held in Berkeley, August 29-September 1, 1953. Discussion chairman: Paul Meadows, University of Nebraska.

in which one feels most adequate for the stated problem in accordance with scientific procedures.

3. To publish findings without censorship.

4. In the classroom, to pursue all methods and to use all materials which would maximize knowledge and understanding of the subject without regard to one's own biases or those of others.

Granted that these four points may not describe the total picture of the social scientist's basic needs, let us examine what some of the delimitations of these needs are. Constraints to free inquiry have always existed. By his very function the teacher and researcher is a disturbing influence. He raises questions, examines existing values, and inquires into private attitudes. In the traditional concept, the teacher was the transmitter of the existent values of the society of which he was a part. In almost every period, however, there were those teachers who sought new ways, new solutions and new truths.

Constraints to the realization of the aforesaid ends spring from:

1. A social climate created by a strong elite. (For example—Congressional investigations). Such a climate:

- a) threatens the economic security of the teacher and researcher.
- b) shuts off the cooperation of subjects (in social attitude tests, interviewers are hesitant about asking certain questions for fear they be labeled subversive.)
- c) Research funds both governmental and private may not be made available for "controversial problems."

2. Political fiat. (For example—legislative restriction to teach certain subjects

in certain ways and not others. This has been characteristic of totalitarian and semi-totalitarian countries.)

3. *Social organization per se.* (The sociologist is restricted to the teaching of sociology, the economist to economics, the psychologist to psychology, etc. Each course is set up generally through tradition in certain demarcated areas. Cooperative research is frequently a compromise in order to achieve coordination. Different types of research make for different kinds of restrictions.)

Fruitful discussion might emerge under each of these items. But time does not permit further elaboration here. Let us examine some of the hopes for the freedom we desire.

1. Teachers are in a position to foster, develop, and diffuse attributes of rationality.

2. It is perhaps the duty of those leaders of ethics and morals in our society to teach these ends as spiritual

goods. Freedom of this kind has been an essential part of our tradition in spite of the fact that it has often been threatened. It can be, I think, established as a basic dominant value in American culture.

3. There is a need to convince the layman that the findings of social scientists are not simply the reflection of the personal opinion and prejudices of the particular researcher. Perhaps there is a need for a more thorough set of standards for the social scientists themselves so that this image created in the public mind with some justification may be erased.

4. Patience for the slow realization of these ends.

5. The existing safeguards in our own country for a free society and the protection of civil liberties.

REFERENCES

- 1 Bertrand Russell. "Freedom and Government," in Ruth Nanda Anshen (ed.), *Freedom: Its Meaning*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1940, p. 251.

II.

EZRA W. GEDDES

University of New Mexico

The topic "Challenges to the Freedom of Social Scientists" takes for granted that social scientists do have freedom, that it is *right* that they do, and that this freedom is threatened and *should be* protected. It is the thesis of this paper that these value assumptions are valid at least in a limited sense and that the freedom of social scientists is challenged. The challenge discussed here is considered to arise necessarily from the current form of economic organization.

Analysis reveals that people are motivated toward the attainment of maximum satisfaction according to their own (culturally, socially and individually derived) definitions of the situation. To be successful in

attaining and maintaining satisfying conditions, one must reduce the barriers which stand in the way. Since the barriers are defined as problems, man's encompassing motivation directs him toward problem reduction. The major obstacles are ignorance and error concerning both "ends" and "means." These are reducible through analysis, discussion and experimentation which, as freedoms, are *right* in-so-far as they contribute to, more than they detract from, "satisfying conditions." Conversely, that which reduces such freedoms is *wrong* and represents a point of challenge to social scientists.

Economically we have a system of competitive struggle for profit. Social norms enjoin all to partici-

pate in the striving. The less successful strivers fall to a lower social status with consequent ramifications for self esteem and fewer material goods. Income tends to gravitate away from the more mentally retarded, the more emotionally unstable, the more poorly trained, the less well organized or those otherwise occupying less advantaged positions.

Derived social problems are as follows: First, some persons attempt to gain the economic rewards through disapproved means. The "problem" may roughly be termed crime and delinquency. Second, many persons of lesser endowment, training and emotional stability simply lose out in the striving. The "problem" is poverty, dependency, apathy, and the outcast. Third, many persons abide by the approved means and continue to strive for the culturally sanctioned ends but have insufficient money income to meet minimum standards. These are included in the "problems" of the ill housed, the ill fed, and those receiving inadequate medical and mental health serv-

ices. These "problem" products of the current economic system are just as much a part of the total picture as the wealth of the "successful."

These problems cannot be resolved without modifying the economy. On the other hand, the present economic structure is considered as "that which has made the nation great." As long as social problems have important causal roots in the fundamentals of the economic way of life, and at the same time the economy is considered to be so satisfying that it cannot be fundamentally modified, antagonism is inevitable. Those who would maintain the *status quo* will be opposed to fundamental reform movements and to tendencies which might result in such movements including the "wrong kind" of discussion and research. Here lies a basic challenge. So long as social problems have their roots in the fundamentals of the economic system, freedom to discuss and experiment in an attempt to find solutions will be challenged.

III.

ODIN W. ANDERSON

*Health Information Foundation
New York City*

It seems to me that there are two phases to this problem of challenges to the freedom of social scientists which should not be confused. One phase, which involves research in particular, is the influence of sources of research funds on the choice of problems to be studied and on the choice between "basic" and "applied" research. We all know the pressure for quick results and so-called practical application. In all likelihood, this

problem is the most profound one facing sociologists and other social scientists.

The other phase entails the problem of engaging in teaching and research in "controversial" fields like race relations, comparative economic systems, and medical economics. Certainly there should be an inherent right within the proper academic framework to engage in teaching and research in any subject.

It appears to me that social scientists encounter difficulties in "controversial" subjects because they are likely to give a "liberal" interpretation and suggested solution. I have never fully resolved for myself whether or not a "liberal" interpretation is inherent in the data or whether it flows more from the unconscious biases of many of the social scientists.

The ideal social science research situation, I suppose, does not exist. The social scientist must be sagacious enough to assess the forces swirling around him and to determine whether he can be assured the proper research context (choice of problem, freedom of interpretation, freedom to publish, etc.). At any given time the prevailing climate of opinion and the sources of research funds will force the

social scientist to make certain compromises regarding his choice of a research problem. It may be possible, for example, for him to choose a research problem which has both theoretical and practical utility. Moreover, he may have to compromise on the depth or breadth of his research formulations, consistent, of course, with reasonable expectations of fruitful negative or positive results. That is, he has to adjust his research plans to the limitations of his budget.

He cannot, however, compromise with the right to publish. He cannot permit his facts and interpretations to be tampered with. In a controversial field he must not wander from his facts or interpret his facts so loosely that he is justifiably open to attack and criticism.

IV.

THOMAS L. BLAIR

Michigan State College

In the past three decades the science of sociology and its method have been put to use in more areas of American life than ever before. Universities have increased their course curricula. Business, governmental and private agencies have made great use of scientific sociological methods of inquiry and analysis. This growth of the usefulness of sociology has had concomitant effects upon the discipline in two very important areas: 1) it has created jobs for the sociologist and thereby given him a new reference group. 2) it has influenced the methods of sociology.

In general it has been those institutions which are specifically non-sociological — community councils, government agencies, labor unions, business concerns — which have

shown the greatest interest in the research methods of sociology and had the greatest effect on the sociologist. The interests of these new employers and their employees are needless to say, not in the growth of science, but in the achievement of practical solutions.

There is no doubt that sociology has been a success in this first half of the twentieth century. Not only has sociology achieved greater usefulness in the general culture but, at the same time, its methods of inquiry have also undergone an evolution to the more systematic and precise. The increased use of statistics, the increasing accuracy and reliability of techniques and methods, the higher standards of proof have increased the fruitfulness of the scientific method and

all this has stimulated still greater precision and reliability in the collection of data.

Nevertheless, the development of sociology as a science has not occurred without clear and persistent dangers to its future growth and to the freedom of the sociologist. There seems to be too great an emphasis on statistical manipulation for its own sake at the expense of the qualitative aspects of the data; too great an emphasis on organized "committee" research and the avoidance of "individual" research; too great a dependence of the sociologist on the non-sociological buyer and consumer; and too great a lapse in the more fundamental ethics of sociology.

The general belief that, above all, science should be free motivates the modern sociologist to inquire about the use of sociology in our society and the role of the sociologist.

If our analysis is correct then the problem and several tentative

solutions may be summed up in the following propositions:

1. The easy recruitment of the social scientist into the non-academic spheres of contemporary life has been a partial consequence of the desire of the sociologist to make his discipline a more systematic, objective science. One result of this has been the limiting of certain areas of investigation bearing upon social problems.

2. The solution to the present conflict between the ethical values of the social scientist and the values of the consumer is not in reverting to intuitive, lone wolf research, but consists in:

- (a) The adequate training of young social scientists in the "folkways of the field," and a more self-conscious scientific approach on the part of those who carry out research.

- (b) The establishment of a code of ethics by which the role of the social scientist both within the academic discipline and in non-academic areas might be evaluated.

- (c) The development of a positive interest in the scientific study of social policy and social problems.

- (d) The creation of a conscious moral force within the discipline that will contest those forces in the general culture which would limit the freedom of the sociologist.

V.

FRANZ ADLER

University of Arkansas

Social scientists, like other organisms, want to eat. Like other human beings, therefore, they must go to work, that is, sell some of their freedom. They may sell a relatively large part of it at a relatively high price working for Government or industry. If however, they consent to teach, they generally accept considerably lower prices, hoping to retain more of their freedom. Two recent trends add new disappointments to this often disappointed expectation. I refer to "organized research" and "general education."

A sociologist or other social scientist entering a teaching job is more and more often expected to submit to integration into an existing research program. Or he may be called upon to organize a departmental, interdepartmental, university-wide, or interuniversity "integrated" research program. The advantages of such arrangements are obvious: cooperation results in mutual stimulation and complementation; pooled funds from institutions go farther than funds of individual professors. The less pleasant aspects of the pattern tend

to be overlooked.

The social scientist doing research within such a program is not acting in his own name, but as an institutional functionary. What he publishes is not merely his publication—though his name may adorn the title page—but primarily a publication of the sponsoring institution. Such institutions, public or private, are foci of many pressures and must watch their public relations. Thus, the front office influence will be felt in three aspects of every "organized" research undertaking: in the selection of the topics—which must be safe; in the carrying out of the research—which must not cause any trouble or any raising of eyebrows; and in the publication of the findings—which must not endanger the flow of funds to the institution.

The way out of this difficulty lies in renewed emphasis upon unsupervised research. Research funds should be available to academic men on the basis of their requests. Having hired a man, administrators should have sufficient confidence in him to endow him with means considered appropriate by him for whatever research task he may have in mind. No further questions need be asked. Cooperation with others should be based on personal understandings without institutional sponsorship. Thus individual freedom of research can be assured. The institution, on the other hand, is free of responsibility for the research on its campus.

Another expectation often facing the teaching social scientist today is that he participate in developing or teaching courses in "general education." There can hardly be much controversy about the desirability of giving students broad backgrounds in the sciences, arts, and humanities. The extreme specialist who knows everything about something, but nothing about anything else, cannot be considered

really educated. Whether present programs actually give these needed broad backgrounds or rather smatterings of ignorance doesn't matter here. But, avowedly or unavowedly, most of these programs have the additional, if not primary, purpose of transmitting certain value orientations.

Teaching is never free of value transmission. Honest teachers will write, talk, and teach in terms of the values they hold. They will try to label their values as such, but can hardly always and consistently do this. In his years of attendance at a nonsectarian and not otherwise value-oriented college, the student will meet teachers with partly complementary, partly identical, and partly contradictory views and values. This will, it is hoped, lead him to form his own value system through selection and maturation. The diversity of values is an essential element of liberal education and the philosophy embodying it is the basis of the demand for academic freedom.

Whenever a school adopts a particular value system, not only does the teacher lose the freedom of teaching his views and values, not only does the student lose the opportunity to choose and develop freely, but the whole academic community loses its small but precious freedom.

If a school officially teaches one specific set of values, it is the right and duty of the community to see that these values be what they consider the right ones. Controls, then, become unavoidable, even desirable. On the other hand, if sociologists wish to retain their freedom of teaching, they will have to fight all attempts at replacing value pluralism with any value monism, as noble as it may ever appear to them. Value pluralism is one of the few good things in our otherwise more than questionable system of higher education.

VI.

ALBERT D. ULLMAN

Tufts College

It would appear to me that there are two distinct challenges to freedom in our society today. First is the external challenge arising from existing conditions of strife between two sets of world powers. The nation is aroused to a degree which indicates our chagrin at not recognizing the menace of Fascism a short time ago, so that this time, with a new threat in view, we are going to be "ready."

If our society is perceived as in danger, then the natural consequence is for those who so perceive the situation to exert pressures towards conformity to the existing way of life. It is the polarity of thinking—"our" system against "theirs"—which seems to me to be the essence of the danger to freedom of thought which derives from the real danger to be found in the world today.

The second kind of challenge is more immediately applicable to the social scientist. The pressures towards conformity, which are expressed as pressures against non-conformity, become internalized so that our thinking grows rigid and restricted. Therefore, the citizen finds it easier *not* to deal with material which could be interpreted

as controversial. Inasmuch as the stuff of which sociology is made consists of social organization, the forms of interaction within social institutions, and, most particularly, social change, the sociologist is placed on an exposed front. This comes at a time in history when more and more social change is the product of rational planning and when freedom to roam throughout the ranges of possibility in social organization is most necessary. If the sociologist is to make a contribution to the processes of social change, then he must avoid the self-imposed restriction of thought and investigation which seems to affect some of us.

At least part of the challenge comes from the persons with whom most sociologists in our society interact; namely, students. Perhaps to a degree which is unique in recent centuries, the student demands to know the "revealed word" as "given" to sociologists.

What the sociologist needs, then, is the courage to be a non-conformist and protection within that position. To deserve this protection, however, he probably should avoid treating hypothesis as revelation.

VII.

THOMAS D. ELIOT

Northwestern University

The total situation as a trans-active field. Freedom is a seamless web: "When the bell tolls. . ." The conditions which threaten freedom:

1. Failure of teachers to inter-

pret principles and values of academic freedom to past generations of students who now represent publics.

2. Public ignorance of events or

issues, and of principles of civil liberty and academic freedom:

a. Ignoring of changes in world scene from 1940 to 1950.

b. Confusion and susceptibility to gossip.

c. Acceptance of the imputation of guilt by association—including past and indirect association—and of guilt by mere accusation or epithet.

3. Silence of non-academic liberals (1) unless themselves threatened (2) when themselves threatened.

4. General atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. ("Your colleagues or students may be Communists or informers!").

5. Provocation of "news" by cynical pressmen.

6. Journalistic and demagogic techniques of insinuation, "smearing," and semantic trickery. (e. g., Sokolsky, Dies, Flynn, Matthews, Chambers, McCarthy).

7. Threatening attacks on the rights of communication in related professional fields (press, arts, church, foundations, publishers, libraries).

8. Lack of clear definitions of terms used to characterize ideas, proposals, and persons ("pinks," "subversives," "leftists," "fellow-travelers," "ultra-liberals," "radicals," etc.).

9. Public confusion of liberals and advocates of reform with state socialists and Communists. The "inevitable road to dictatorship" doctrine.

10. Repression of Communists leading them to go underground and be more dangerous—as predicted by civil libertarians for a generation.

11. Actual discovery of crypto-Communists, used as excuse for accusing and hounding outspoken liberals.

12. Abuse of legislative committees and their alleged powers to investigate matters not relevant to lawmaking. Exposes for publicity or spite.

13. General announcements from

legislative committees that colleges will be investigated to expose or root out Communists and "subversives", with intimidating effects all down the line, even if no investigation follows.

14. Tacit assumptions that researchers and teachers are not appointees of professional responsibility, but *hired men* like managers or "public relations counselors" and therefore subject to similar contractual and directive controls.

15. Test oaths for teachers (legislative or local).

16. Vulnerability of college administrations and sociologists who depend upon taxes, tax exemptions and public grants.

17. Attacks and threats now also against college presidents (Rainey, Stoddard).

18. Efforts by some college presidents to set a back-fire against legislative or public persecution by "cleaning house" in advance—or by threatening their own campus "progressives."

19. Insufficient advance reassurance, leadership, and backing of liberal faculty groups by administrators, who may thus seem to many liberal teachers a potential threat rather than defenders of the faith.

20. Complaisance of some college administrators in "welcoming" any and all legislative investigations of faculty opinion, and disciplining of teachers who resist them.

21. Failure to distinguish between (1) investigations for security measures, (2) investigations of administrative policy and practice, and (3) investigations of faculty members' opinions, associations, class teaching and public communications.

22. Yieldings by faculties themselves; failing to take a clear, consistent and courageous position or to take the offensive.

23. Passive acceptance of teachers' test-oaths by institutions and

individuals.

24. Failure of social scientists to protest until or unless personally attacked. "Self-interest" in failing to defend others.

25. Fear of losing status or opportunity if called names. ("Don't stick your neck out".)

26. Presence of a few who do propagandize in such a way as to deny students access to other relevant facts or ideas, or to pressure them into acceptance of their "ism"—be it political, ethnic, economic, or religious. Suspicion and criticism of such men serves as a threat to the security and status of the rest of us.

27. Paucity of interest, in A.A.U.P., faculties and learned societies, in positive public interpretation of the values of academic freedom and the dangers in limiting it.

28. Paucity of emphasis, in

A.A.U.P., faculties, and learned societies, upon professional academic integrity, ethics, duties, standards and responsibilities; resolutions and organized machinery and procedures having largely implemented the defense of *rights* rather than self-enforcement or professional enforcement of *obligations*.

29. Lack, in faculties, A.A.U.P., and most social science organizations, of functional structures for group self-discipline, to which administrators and boards (instead of acting on their own) could report suspected violations of professional responsibility as do doctors and lawyers.

30. Special vulnerabilities of sociologists: (1) Their history of dog-good-ism. (2) Their fear of dog-good-ism.

Aside from these conditions, American social scientists' freedom is not threatened.

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST

ARNOLD M. ROSE

University of Minnesota

The increase of knowledge about the control of the physical world has raised in the minds of informed citizens the question as to whether society will be able to control this knowledge. The problem has demanded a more immediate solution with the invention of the atomic bomb. The question used to be raised as to how we can prevent the machine from enslaving man; the one now more frequently raised is how we can prevent atomic energy from destroying man and his civilization. How can our society gain the wisdom, the good will, and the commonness of purpose to control this and other inventions?

For many social scientists the question has become one of discovering enough about society so

that society can, if it wishes to use this knowledge, control the use of physical knowledge. Hornell Hart, for example, poses the problem in these words:

... the fact of technological acceleration means that the problems of the future will keep on compounding and expanding until they wreck our world, or until organized intelligence applies science effectively to mastering the social problems which technological acceleration creates. (1)

The social scientist usually stops here, and does not inquire further. He seldom raises the logically next question: once the social scientists gain the social knowledge which can be used to control physical knowledge and to control society, how will this social knowledge be controlled? What is to prevent a

social scientist from using social knowledge to expedite the enslavement or destruction of society? What is to prevent the social scientist from selling or giving his knowledge to one group in society for the purpose of controlling another group? Of course, many social scientists feel that these questions are a little premature. After all, they say, the knowledge we produce is so trivial that it is no possible threat to society in the way that knowledge produced by physical scientists is. But the belief that social science knowledge has not yet developed to a point where it influences society is not correct, and the attitude that social scientists should not be concerned with their own influence on society is not consistent with their frequently expressed concern about developing social science knowledge that will aid in controlling physical science knowledge. If we are striving toward the control of physical science knowledge, should we not also consider the control of the potential social knowledge that is to control the physical knowledge?

There are many evidences that we are acquiring some potentially dangerous social knowledge, that we are developing social "atomic energy," to speak figuratively. For example, we have witnessed the power of propaganda and other "mass persuasion" and mob-incitement techniques to control people, destroy political enemies and seize power. Even though Hitler may have derived his knowledge largely from brilliant intuition, social scientists can analyze the patterns of his successes and failures, and from them draw conclusions as to how masses of people can be incited and controlled in the future. There have been books on the "governing of men," "mass persuasion," and on a wide range of techniques of psychological warfare, stating a number of tested

principles for controlling the minds of men. (2)

We can eliminate some value judgments from the conclusion by saying in a factual way that knowledge about society can be used by one group to enhance its power at the expense of another group. Expressed thus, we are simply restating the old truism that knowledge is power. In the case of the social scientists' knowledge, it is political and economic power with which we are concerned. Wirth has stated the proposition in even more general terms: "Every assertion of a 'fact' about the social world touches the interests of some individual or group." (6)

Some questions are in order as to what kinds of persons these social scientists are who are acquiring this knowledge and potential power. Are they the sort of persons who will use their knowledge for their own gain or the gain of a minority within society whom they happen to favor? The answer to this question involves a systematic study of the social backgrounds, the personality traits, and the attitudes of the social scientists. Until such a study is made, we cannot begin to answer the fundamental question about what the social scientists will do with their knowledge. We can, however, give a partial answer to an allied question: are there any tendencies observable among social scientists which might lead them to use their knowledge for ends dangerous to society as a whole or to large segments of society? Even a hasty examination of the processes by which social scientists get trained and do their research would lead one to answer tentatively in the affirmative.

In the first place, social scientists have a not-too-far-from-average number of human frailties and there are none but the ordinary

controls prevalent in our society to prevent a social scientist's frailties from directing his knowledge toward ends dangerous to society. For instance, he may be selfish and callous of others. Such an attitude may have been stimulated by the shortage of opportunities available to satisfy his aspirations, especially during the war boom.

Few would deny that some American social scientists have been "bought" when the purchase has been made under certain rules of "good taste." An economic depression which accentuates the competition among social scientists, or an increase in the monetary or prestige rewards to be striven for, could demoralize a significant proportion of social scientists.

A second fact to be noted is the low prestige of the social sciences and the consequent frustration of the social scientist. Intellectuals generally have never had as high prestige in the United States as they enjoy in most European countries, and education is far from being the most important determinant of social status. Social scientists have a lower status than do physical and biological scientists, not only in the minds of the general public but frequently in their own minds as well. Many social scientists feel inferior to natural scientists in the possession of specialized knowledge and in the possession of techniques for acquiring new knowledge. The press campaign to discredit social scientists during the New Deal era, which was part of a larger political campaign, did not increase the self-respect of the social scientists. They do not hold their discipline in the highest esteem, and that results in a sense of personal insecurity for many of them. Outward evidences of this are seen in movements within the disciplines of psychology and sociology to ape

the techniques of the physical sciences, even at the sacrifice of some of the subject matter of their own disciplines. It is seen even more sharply in the number of social scientists who escape academic life for business or government work when the opportunity offers itself. These people are not so devoted to the pursuit of knowledge as they claimed to be. The statement of this fact should not be taken as an accusation, or an attempt to fix blame, but as an evidence of the relatively low prestige of the academic pursuit in the social sciences.

The implication of these remarks is that social scientists experience enough frustration in the pursuit of social knowledge so that they might be willing to offer their services to anybody who could pay a high price for them. There is a deep desire in every social scientist to tell the world "I told you so" after all the questioning gibes about the value and significance of his work.

Even if the social scientist never sells his knowledge for personal profit or prestige, he has some tendencies which will allow him to give it away without regard to whom he gives it. Some social scientists believe that knowledge has no relation to social action, that conscious ideas and the possession of factual information cannot effect social change. We cannot debate this issue here, but suffice it to say that if social scientists believe there is a lag between the invention of material objects and the invention of social wisdom to control these material objects, there is logically implied in this contention the belief that social knowledge can be used to change the course of society. However, if social scientists believe that their knowledge can have no social influence, they are likely to give away their knowledge without much con-

cern as to where it is going.

It would be a mistake to give the impression that scientists have been completely unaware of the dangers they create for society. The natural scientists never had to worry too much prior to 1940 about the possibly harmful social effects of their discoveries, as the overwhelming proportion of their discoveries seemed to increase the health, standard of living, and opportunities of people. Of course, the broader social implications of certain discoveries were ignored — such as whether the creation of leisure time due to productive efficiency was really conducive to happiness — because there was unconscious acceptance of the notion that "progress" would eliminate these "cultural lags." When the few discoveries were made that seemed to have direct potentialities for human harm, the natural scientists were usually upset. For example Alfred Nobel, the inventor of dynamite, set up the Nobel peace prize. David Lillienthal, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, wrote:

... it is by no manner of means inevitable that scientific research and technology will work for good. It is equally possible that they may yield a harvest of bitter fruit. When those speak who imply that our problem is only one of securing more and more funds for more and more scientific workers in private or public research, we need constantly to remind ourselves that, in terms of human happiness and freedom, such a conclusion is far from true. Unless research and technology are consciously related to a central purpose of human welfare, unless research is defined and directed by those who believe in and who have faith in people and in democratic ends and means, it may well be that the more money we spend on research the further we miss the mark. It is like trying to reach your destination in an automobile that is going in the wrong direction; the faster you drive the farther away from your goal you will be. (3)

This writer would guess that most physical scientists were

shocked when, after the invention of the atomic bomb, several social scientists and philosophers claimed that science is amoral. Many physical scientists began to urge social scientists to develop social means of control over atomic energy, and they asked us for effective techniques of communicating to the public some of the dangerous implications of the recent discoveries. They themselves set up organizations to disseminate information on the potential social influence of the discovery of how to tap atomic energy. Some social scientists have also expressed awareness of the possible harmful social implications of social science knowledge.

Another socially dangerous tendency is for educated people, generally, to identify themselves with the upper classes and to separate themselves from the poorly educated. The snobbery of family background in Europe is almost matched by the snobbery of education in America. A certain amount of separation, based on differences of interest, is natural. The problem is that the division is so complete that educated people, while retaining their respect for wealth, lose their respect for the more common values. The isolation is physical as well as social, since the universities, their faculties, students, and hangers-on frequently form distinct communities. It would be no more desirable for social scientists to identify with the lower classes than with the upper classes. What is desirable for scientific purposes is to have the "free-floating" objectivity that Karl Mannheim spoke of and to have contact with all sectors of society. Also, some social scientists allow their attitudes from their role as scientists to be carried over into their role as citizens. They believe they are exempt from social responsibilities, and they have the tendency of educated persons gen-

erally to regard themselves as superior to the common herd. When social knowledge is discovered that can control the majority of the people, it can become dangerous to that majority because of these attitudes of the holders of the social knowledge.

There is possibly also less use of rigorous procedure and less certainty of the reliability and validity of conclusions in the social sciences than in the natural sciences. The criteria of scientific method are much clearer, and the tests for reliability and validity much simpler in the natural sciences than in the social sciences, and therefore it is much easier to be rigorous and unswerving in the former fields. A survey of replicated studies in the social sciences shows a high proportion that fail to reach the same conclusion as the original study. (4) Social scientists may thus be *unaware* that sometimes they are merely satisfying a propagandist's need rather than producing valid knowledge.

To the extent that the above statements are true, and admittedly they require further evidence before they can be regarded as of high validity, certain actions are incumbent upon social scientists if they are not to be dangerous to our society. One approach is to demand that social scientists engage only in "pure science," as opposed to "applied science," and it is likely that one reason for the popularity of this demand is a deep-seated but inhibited concern about the social responsibility of the social scientist. Some of those who are engaged in the most utilitarian of studies, for business or government, are perhaps for that reason those who cry the loudest for "basic research" and "pure science." The points made in this paper however, indicate that "pure science" and a profession which aims at "pure science" cannot

avoid having some kind of social influence. Knowledge is power, and if we — as social scientists — wish to avoid the misuse of the power we produce, we shall be obliged to take certain more positive steps. I cannot presume to offer a solution, as the problem is too difficult, and too little thought has thus far been concentrated on it.

In general, my suggestions would follow the sociological principle that the way to increase informal social control over an individual is to increase his integration into the society, develop his sense of social responsibility toward the society, and to give the society a greater understanding of his activities. The individual in this case is the social scientist, and it is deemed necessary to increase informal social controls over him because he is on the verge of discovering knowledge that could lead to a redistribution of power relations in the society. If the latter happens, society as a whole or some sector of society will be hurt, or society may check the redistribution of power in time and clamp down formal social controls over the social scientist. Any of these prospects is dangerous to democratic society and to science. While science formerly thrived under monarchies, even absolute ones (possibly because the rulers were not concerned with science), the evidence from modern *totalitarian* dictatorships is that they distort science even as they exploit it. (5) Solutions must be sought in the direction of increasing the chances that the social scientist's activities are an asset to democratic society. Social scientists, either as individuals or as a group, are by no means in complete control of the situation, because knowledge produced for "its own sake" or for "good" purpose may be perverted to other purposes. But social scientists can make use of those de-

grees of freedom that the larger society permits.

REFERENCES

1. Hornell Hart, "Technological Acceleration and the Atomic Bomb," *American Sociological Review*, 11 (June, 1946), 291.
2. For example: Alexander Leighton, *The Governing of Men*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1945; Paul M. A. Linebarger, *Psychological Warfare*, Washington, D.C.: Infantry Journal Press, 1948; Robert K. Merton, *Mass Persuasion*, New York: Harper Brothers, 1946; Dorwin Cartwright, "Some Principles of Mass Persuasion," *Human Relations*, 2 (1949), 197-292.
3. David E. Lilienthal "Research Has a Moral Responsibility," *The Christian Century*, 62 (July 4, 1945), 786-787.
4. Arnold M. Rose, "Generalizations in the Social Sciences," *American Journal of*

Sociology, LIX (July, 1953), 49-58.

5. Two studies of how Hitler's government turned scientists into propagandists and distorted science itself are: (1) Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors*, New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, 1946 and (2) H. L. Ansbacher, "Testing Management and Reactions of Foreign Workers in Germany During World War II," *American Psychologist*, 5 (1950), 38-49. Similar reports for the Soviet Union are the following: (1) Stuart A. Rice, "Methodology Conference of the Central Statistical Administration, USSR," *Scientific Monthly*, LXXV (August, 1952) 71-78; (2) E. Ashby, "Marxism versus Science," *New York Times Magazine*, January 6, 1952, pp. 12 ff.; (3) Evsey D. Domar, "The Varga Controversy," *American Economic Review*, 40 (1950), 132-151.
6. Louis Wirth, Preface to Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936, p. xvii.

THE DANGERS OF PROJECT RESEARCH*

HAROLD W. DODDS

President, Princeton University

When we turn to the related function of a university, the advancement of learning, we observe that the past two decades have brought certain changes in the conditions and nature of research which embody some dangers and temptations to faculties and administrations alike. I refer of course to the great development of so-called sponsored or project research of which the natural and applied sciences have been the chief, though not the sole, beneficiaries. The government has been much the biggest contributor to this type of research, a fact which in itself raises troublesome and critical problems still to be resolved.

*This paper is an excerpt from the ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT HAROLD W. DODDS AT OPENING EXERCISES OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY — 11 A.M., SEPTEMBER 20, 1953 IN THE UNIVERSITY CHAPEL.

PROJECT RESEARCH

The phrase "project research" has come to describe a special pattern of research undertakings in which the funds (often less than the full cost) are provided by a special grant by an individual or corporation, or charitable foundation, or under a contract with a governmental agency. The source which furnishes the funds does so in the understanding that the research will be directed to solving a problem in a specific area which has been mutually agreed upon in advance. The emphasis is usually upon results which are measured by the success attained in answering the particular question which the project set out to attack. Much project research is directed to limited objectives in contrast to freely roaming inquiry directed to new basic knowledge, a characteristic, it must be conceded, shared by con-

ventional research. By no means, of course, are all research funds which a university receives on a term basis from government, corporations, foundations or individuals properly to be considered project grants. Some are for wide and general purposes which contemplate the utmost freedom of use on the part of the university or the individual; but such general support of scholarship and research is not what has come to be known technically as project research support.

As I have indicated, project research is usually directed to a definite problem, perhaps to the answer of a specific question. Project grants are in the nature of a contract to perform a certain research job. For these reasons they often appeal to donors in a way in which general support of free ranging scholarship does not. In this day of excessively high costs of research in so many fields this is not a negligible asset, I admit.

Another merit of project research is that it often, though not always, involves team play in contrast to the individual scholar working by himself, sometimes in too lonely grandeur in his own ivory tower. When the team play is good, it works for cross-fertilization and the mutual stimulation which intellectual intercourse engenders. Young scholars find places on the teams and thus may enjoy opportunities for intimate association with older men which might otherwise be denied them. In many cases modern research entails the collecting, marshalling and interpretation of masses of data beyond the capacity of a single scholar to assemble or digest. In such situations a team is a natural solution.

CONTRACTUAL RESPONSIBILITY

Furthermore, project research lays an external discipline upon the leader and his team to do an expeditious and workmanlike job.

The grant under which a project is carried on is in the nature of a contract between the agency which is financing it and the scientists in respect to whom the funds were contributed. Thus the latter pledge their faith and credit to the performance of an agreement entered into in good faith by both parties. Few will deny that a contractual responsibility to an external donor by which the scholar or scientist pledges his personal faith and honor as a condition of the grant is without merit. An outside inquisitor empowered to pass judgment on inside research may be a nuisance to the individual scholar and the president of the university alike, but he has a place.

So much for the advantages of sponsored project research. Its dangers and limitations are equally clear. Team play is healthy and invigorating to a point, but a stage may come at which it yields diminishing returns to the participants. It is no substitute for, indeed it may evolve into a deterrent to, the cultivation of a capacity for self-powered inquiry. Stimulation by others may easily lead one into a state of intellectual dependence on others, through a process by which the participant may become adept in reflecting sparks from others but unable to generate sparks of his own.

DANGER OF PROJECTITIS

With the abundance of project research money currently available, we are in danger of succumbing to a new disease for which no antibiotic drug has been discovered; namely, "projectitis." Projectitis is an unhappy addiction to limited objectives, perhaps at the very moment at which the individual should be broadening his own comprehension and deepening his knowledge of his discipline, with freedom for roving speculation in an atmosphere unencumbered by the pressures of problem-solving commitments to

external agencies.

Concentration upon organized team projects which have limited objectives and are circumscribed by a production schedule may operate to deflect interest from truly basic scholarship which it is the duty of universities to carry on. The universities must not fail in this broad function, for no other agency in society will assume it if they do.

Competent observers are particularly concerned regarding the effect of over-indulgence in projects upon our young scholars and scientists. They fear that there are a goodly number of such throughout our universities whose future contributions to learning are being reduced by pre-occupation with the limited objectives of project research, at a time of life at which opportunities are most essential for their own spontaneous development in an atmosphere of freedom from that degree of regimentation which team work on a project usually involves. As with so many elements of life the question is really one of proper balance, a goal which we all know is never easy to attain..

GOVERNMENT INTEREST

I do not suggest that growth in spontaneous individual scholarship implies unplanned and vagrant drifting without chart or compass. Naturally one must have a purpose and the sooner one can find a scholarly objective the better. But by the same token the young scholar must not become impaled easily on the sharp stake of a narrow specialty or trapped into being but a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for his academic superiors.

When we turn to the special problems of governmental support of project research, we are confronted with several inexorable factors new to the experience of the private university. To date Government's chief interest, indeed the prime political justification for

most of its research contracts with universities, is national defense. This imposes a certain responsibility upon universities to accept projects which may contribute to national safety. Universities, however, cannot afford to be swerved from their obligation to advance fundamental knowledge irrespective of measured utilitarian values. Investigation for the purposes of quick results which can promptly be put into production must always be accommodated to our historic function to seek out new knowledge for itself alone. On the other hand, the astronomical costs of much of modern scientific and technological research suggests that there is no escape from the proposition that henceforth government must help to support basic, "pure" science as well as applied science. In the year 1951-52 federal funds totalling \$295,000,000 were obligated for research and development at 225 universities and colleges, and both basic and applied science benefitted in varying degrees.

SECRECY REQUIREMENTS

Time does not permit adequate consideration of the unresolved issues in respect to government support of research. They are complex and distressing to many scientists; and their solution is not yet in sight. One of the most critical problems touches the secrecy requirements which are imposed when military considerations are involved. It is the belief of most scientists that the government has been excessively cautious in "classifying" research projects and in dictating on security grounds who shall and shall not participate. Such imposed secrecy contravenes the principle of free pooling of knowledge by which all science has progressed. Had European fundamental science been strictly national, had it not been available to use in years past, America today would be a vastly different country, perhaps a subject

nation. Barriers to free trade in ideas can serve only to throttle the progress of scientific discovery. National defense may justify them on occasion; but the price paid for secrecy is high in terms of the measure of human betterment which otherwise would be possible.

BALANCING OF PROS AND CONS

What the policy of the University should be, as it endeavors to balance the pros and cons of government support of research, is not easily answered. Wisdom, as I have indicated, consists of a correct balancing of the two. Our faculty has recognized that to refuse entirely to participate in any classified research would be to deny the University's responsibility to serve the nation in its hour of need, but it rightfully insists that such research be held to a minimum with a minimum of encroachment upon normal practice.

Three further principles apply to all types of project research whether supported by government or otherwise. One is that each

undertaking be related to the basic, long-term programs of scholarship which members of the faculty have carved out for themselves. Extraneous business should not be accepted, however tempting, simply because funds for it are available. A second principle is that the University is duty bound to maintain and improve its own resources and inner facilities for the support of its own programs in its own discretion. Only by so doing can it maintain control over its destiny and assure the prosecution of long term free ranging plans for scholarly investigations. A third principle is that the University must exercise the same diligence and wisdom in the utilization of its own resources as it feels bound to do in respect to grants from outside under specific project agreements. In both cases the university and its faculty are but trustees of funds committed to their joint care, not for their own personal pleasure and aggrandizement but solely to promote human welfare.

PRESSURES UPON RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION IN SOCIOLOGY

MABEL A. ELLIOTT

Pennsylvania College for Women

For the purposes of this analysis, pressures will be defined as constraints imposed upon sociologists for the purpose of influencing (1) research scholars in their selection and execution of projects and the published conclusion from such research and (2) the nature of materials presented in college text books as developed by sociologists.**

I shall limit my remarks to a brief mention of some of the major influences constraining the research scholar or author from his or her point of reference. The pressures which will be discussed are (1) group inertia (2) the state of public opinion (3) power (or status) controls over the research worker (4) fear and/or respect derived from such status or power (5) desire for approval and (6) the special pressures of publishers and editors. These pressures obviously overlap and all tend to exist in varying degree in each situation.

GROUP INERTIA

Inertia may be regarded as the general tendency within a culture to perpetuate existing norms of behavior, and to resist changes which disrupt the *status quo*. Research sociologists are thus constrained to work on types of research in

which their conclusions will not continually threaten either accepted practices or the established powers. In consequence we have many examples of research sociologists who spend time working with trivia or substituting "methodology" for data of importance. Such sociologists may count and classify the birthplaces of distinguished men of science or the opinions of students on the desirable traits in a husband. Both are interesting but undisturbing data.

Inertia may also result in sociologists devising projects which definitely aim to preserve (mayhap while improving) the *status quo*. Such activity is often designated research in applied sociology. Some of this is obviously "to the good." Thus work in human relations in the field of industry has done much to iron out snags in the relationships between employer and employee.

THE STATE OF PUBLIC OPINION

The type of pressure on research workers in sociology varies obviously with the state of public opinion. In one university in the Middle West a sociology professor collaborated with a local clergyman in making a housing study. These two not only compiled an article; they also planned an exhibit for "Clean Up Week" in which some of the worst slums of the city were displayed. This exhibit was almost immediately denounced by a local newspaper as "showing our dirty linen in public." I happened to be that college professor. In the metropolitan area, however, such a research project might be considered "news," as the vigorous expose of

* A revised version of a paper read to the Committee on Standards and Ethics in Research Practice at the meeting of the American Sociological Society held in Berkeley, California, August 30 - September 1, 1953.

**Although most of my comments refer to sociological research, my discussion is also relevant to the problems of textbook authors, because research data furnish so much of the material from which textbooks are derived.

slum conditions this summer by a reporter on the *Chicago Daily News* aptly illustrates. Time and place are thus often factors in successful research.

POWER PRESSURES

All pressures involve power, but I am using the term power pressures selectively to indicate the constraint imposed because of the great authority attached to persons or groups of persons because of their status. The major varieties of power pressures are the following:

The Vested Interests

The nature of the power pressure on research workers varies from community to community because of the nature of local fears. I happen to live in the industrial capital of America. Here it is relatively easy to study juvenile court cases, bad housing or ecological trends, or the political participation of our citizens. We can even study the recreational needs of persons in underprivileged areas without criticism because the recreational motivations of depressed groups are not considered antithetical to the *status quo*. Our great heavy industry center presents all the problems of class, status, conflict between capital and labor, sordid living surroundings, etc., and we should be doing the most important sociological research in the nation. At the same time, the dominant business men who control heavy industry have enormous political and cultural power. They finance the community chest, sponsor the symphony, sit on boards of trustees of colleges and contribute to their endowment campaigns. They also finance foundations and research. Because of the power they wield, any major research into the social aspects of industrial relations can come only if it secures their support. So long as industrialists are sensitive or

fearful about being investigated, powerful opposition to obtaining research grants in this area of human relationships may be expected. Nevertheless, industrial executives have manifested an increased interest in maintaining employee good will and favorable public opinion. Managers of industries have studied economics and sociology and their attitudes toward research have altered markedly within twenty years. Their pressures are therefore more subtle than formerly partly because of their desire for good will.

Minority Group Pressures

Not all of the powerful pressures are those of economic groups. Organized minority groups also exert powerful pressures. In general sociologists have supported minority groups, but it is becoming exceedingly difficult, for example, to secure social data on a racial basis in many cities because of the pressures exerted by the Urban League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. We all recognize that the Negro demand for consideration of Negroes as persons rather than as Negroes is deeply rooted in the discrimination which they have suffered. Nevertheless their present passion for anonymity also makes it difficult for all of us, Negro sociologists as well as white to analyze social data concerning the Negro group.

For example, one of my ablest students recently made an analysis of public assistance cases in the aid-to-dependent children category in the East Liberty section of Pittsburgh. From a sociological viewpoint it would have been desirable to know the race of those aided as well as how many were widows, widowers, or unmarried parents. Nowhere on the face card of the cases covered was there any mention of race, marital status of parents, or legitimacy of

the child and this is at the insistence of Negroes. Detailed investigation of the cases disclosed, however, that the majority of parents so aided were unmarried Negro mothers. This is not a prejudiced opinion, but an established social fact. Present pressures, however, make it very difficult for federal or state research workers to publish such data.

Political Pressures

Of all pressures the crude pressures of political authority are probably the most alarming of those constraining present-day researchers and writers. Because of the widespread hysteria over Communist influences, many college text-book writers are ignoring the controversial issues of modern society in an attempt to play safe with the pressures which may threaten their status and jobs. The tragic outcome of the intimidating effect of loyalty oaths and of congressional investigating committees is yet to be measured. It is obvious, however, that these political measures cannot help but limit the research activities and writings of competent scholars. When the intellectual leaders of the country sell their intellectual integrity for job security, danger is rife in the land, for the validity of research and college instruction is at stake. Robert Hutchins has repeatedly reminded us that educators are afraid. But they should also be afraid of fear. For nowhere was the supine character of intellectual leadership better illustrated than in Nazi Germany where most of the university professors failed to rise to denounce the intellectual controls which Hitler imposed. Hitler, we do well to recall, rose to power on the slogan that he was saving Germany from the Communists. It is well for American educators to remember that those who pretend to save the country from without are sometimes gross

enemies from within.

The political pressures now being exerted to rid our libraries of books and to investigate colleges are especially serious. It is salutary, however, to read that the Alabama State Board of Education has recently resisted pressure and refused to ban books because their authors, illustrators or editors have been members of organizations on the Attorney General's, subversive lists. Books are to be judged on their merits as books in Alabama and we should insist that they be so judged in the Halls of Congress.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EMOTIONAL ASPECTS OF PRESSURES

Fear, respect and desire for approval are all emotional tendencies which limit the research activities of individual sociologists. Fear is a negative aspect of power and keeps many researchers hard at work on the unimportant and inconsequential tasks, because no one objects to the conclusions from inoffensive data.

A department head may refuse to recommend a sociologist whose research and writing abilities exceed his own. The master's jealousy of his talented apprentice may limit research in many ways which are well known to our profession.

Respect for authority, while related to fear, may retard research because of a genuine admiration for the viewpoint of the one exercising power, i.e., because of his scholarship, rank, etc. For example, genuinely devout Roman Catholic sociologists are not inclined to investigate the effect of social rules and regulations which have been established by the Church hierarchy. Respect for authority likewise limits those Catholic textbook writers who present sociological theory within a framework of acceptable theological doctrine. Non-Catholic textbook writers are likewise subject to pressures from

religious groups since the adoption of a book may be affected by avowed opposition from orthodox Fundamentalists. Publishers often warn authors to be more restrained in their criticism of existing institutions. Or their editors may use a powerful blue pencil and, since the writer wants to publish his material, he may acquiesce.

Desire for approval, which may or may not be derived from both fear and respect for powers that be, is an eminently worthy desire if it does not limit the value of the research or destroy the integrity of the researcher. Actually this motive is often indistinguishable from the obsequious desire to conform to the powerful pressures of those who hold promotions in their hand. Sociologists as students of public opinion are also in a position to help create public opinion if they will be realistic enough to do as much as they can toward gaining an acceptance of research projects. This does not mean that they should sacrifice their integrity, but that they sacrifice grandiose ambitions.

THE PRESSURES OF EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS

In their achievements research scholars will be aided and abetted by the research of other scholars and they will share in the common fund of available data. This does not mean, in my estimation, that the research workers who work patiently and without economic reward should be impelled to give their materials without any reservations to persons who seek to

make a financial profit from their intensive effort. This is an especially unethical pressure to which authors of scientific articles are currently subjected. I refer to the question of reprinting articles of research sociologists for profit, but without any remuneration to the persons who have spent weeks, months or years in setting up research projects and compiling and analyzing the data.

I therefore submit these propositions for consideration by our professional societies: First, that our professional journals be copyrighted and second, that all permissions to reprint articles from such journals should be made on a fee or a royalty basis. Third, more professional societies might follow the examples of the Society for the Study of Social Problems and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues in marketing a book of readings edited by a committee of the society. Such a venture might recoup the society's depleted treasury and every author of articles would be happy to contribute either all or part of the royalties as might be decided.

Sociologists and for that matter virtually all other college professors should recognize when they are being exploited. They often willingly give countless hours of professional service to community projects. There is no reason, however, for their giving their creative effort free to persons whose basic aim is profit making. It is one pressure which sociologists have it within their power to resist.

RESEARCH FUNDS AND THE PUBLICLY EMPLOYED SOCIOLOGIST*

CARROLL D. CLARK

University of Kansas

Sociologists in public colleges and universities and in governmental agencies are confronted with a variety of ethical problems growing out of their relations with the sources that supply their research funds. While support of research in the social sciences is still niggardly in comparison with the physical and biological sciences, it has increased quite rapidly during the past decade. As private business interests and departments of government become convinced of the practical utility of sociological research and proceed to underwrite it, ethical issues inevitably arise. The present paper attempts to deal with some of major concern.

The research sociologist is dedicated to the task of enlarging the verified knowledge of the social relations of mankind. Like the scientist in any other field, he follows the canons of dispassionate inquiry—objectivity, rigorous adherence to sound investigational procedures, and careful reporting of methods and results. Though he eschews value bias in collecting facts and testing hypotheses, he is guided by his value judgments in selecting problems worthy of study and in investigating them by the accredited methods of science. His immediate allegiance is to the discipline he serves; his ultimate allegiance to the society he studies. To paraphrase Thomas and Znaniecki, society has extended him credit with which to launch his

business of research investigation, but in good season he must pay the debt with interest.

Sociologists in public institutions derive their research funds from both public and private sources. In neither case can it be assumed that those putting up the money understand fully or are swayed by the normative standards that guide the sociologist in his search for scientific knowledge. Either source may at times represent interests which, though not necessarily venal, are overtly or covertly opposed to untrammelled sociological investigation.

Sociologists in municipal and state supported colleges and universities work in settings likely to be sensitive to political repercussions. Any research finding that runs counter to the sentiments of special-interest groups or that offends beliefs rooted in the mores of the general populace is likely to call down the wrath of indignant taxpayers upon the administrative head of the institution, who in turn will call the sociologist on the mat. Unless he is assured of strong backing by his administrative superiors, the effect may be to make the sociologist seek refuge in minor, non-controversial studies likely to be adjudged innocuous. Needless to say, an ethics of sociological research consonant with the heavy social obligation of the sociologist, does not countenance a retreat of this kind, but demands a bold advance on problems of vital significance regardless of controversial bearings.

Here it should be stressed that sociologists have a responsibility to plan their researches and report

*A revised version of a paper read to the Committee on Standards and Ethics in Research Practice at the meeting of the American Sociological Society held in Berkeley, California, August 30-September 1, 1953.

their findings in such a way as to avoid gratuitous offense and to minimize misunderstandings on the part of the laity. Where findings are of considerable popular interest, this may entail careful attention to such matters as the content of statements released to the newspaper press, or made in public speeches. Not infrequently it is in these communications to the public, rather than in the technical articles or monographs, that misleading interpretations arise. If his findings are news, the research sociologist should lend his hand to those publicizing the information to the end that skillful and accurate popularization rather than distorted or sensational reports go forth.

Serious difficulties may arise when the sponsor of research has a strong stake in the outcome of the investigation. If this concern is known, or can be strongly inferred, the sociologist should take forthright measures. In some cases, he may see fit to reject outright projects whose sponsorship might not leave him a free hand. Unfortunately, the sociologist employed in a public institutions is not always in a position to do this. If committed by action at a higher level, the best that he may be able to do is to make it clear to all concerned that his project will not be designed to produce pre-determined results. To collaborate or connive in a research undertaking manipulated to yield specious findings would not only destroy his integrity as a professional sociologist, but would serve to subvert the very foundations of our nascent science.

Another type of ethical dilemma arises in connection with work in "research bureaus," or agencies similarly designated, which are frequently set up in an ancillary re-

lation to teaching departments, extension divisions, social work departments, or the like. The sociologist may welcome the establishment of such an agency as a means of subsidizing his efforts in research. But too often he discovers that there are overwhelming pressures to direct the activities of the agency into community service functions, practical surveys, and *ad hoc* studies. Eventually he may find that fundamental research is being engulfed by the demands for mere information-gathering or other practical services. A legitimate place, and a very useful one, exists for the community service bureau and similar practical agencies, but provision for such needs should not be made at the expense of *bona fide* sociological research.

With regard to commercial or propagandistic interests which seek to have sociologists grind their axes, little need to be said here. If there are some calling themselves sociologists who will sell their research services in such venal fashion, no doubt we all would agree that they should wherever possible be exposed and read out of the ranks of true professionals. Unfortunately, it is not always easy to get at the true facts in such instances. The establishment of ethical norms on a level of high generality is always necessary and important in the development of a profession. The vital test of professional growth is measured, however, in the efficacy with which these norms are applied to specific cases, and the success achieved in social control by the professional group. As their discipline matures, sociologists must give more thought to the implementation of professional controls in the interests of consensually validated normative standards.

THE CHOICE OF RESEARCH PROJECTS*

S. M. MILLER

Brooklyn College

This paper addresses itself to the problem:

What types of research projects with and without subsidies, are proper for researchers to undertake (a) as part of an academic career, (b) in an academic research bureau, (c) in an independent non-profit research institution, (d) in a commercial research agency, and (e) in a research department of a government, civic organization or business?***

CRITERIA

The term "proper" in the statement of the present problem can be construed in at least two ways: (1) permissible behavior of a scientist, i.e., going beyond this point constitutes non-scientific behavior; (2) the behavior of a scientist which contributes optimally to scientific advancement. The distinction is important because frequently when we speak in terms of scientific ethics we mean (1) though we talk in terms of (2).

My feeling is that some general standards for judging behavior are necessary. The serious scientist needs increasingly to have a set of standards for himself by which he can decide what investigations are proper for him. I would suggest using these two guide lines:

Information research — propaganda research: When a research worker engages in research not to gain understanding but to propa-

gandize for a cause, he is not acting as a scientist. His efforts are to prove a case, irrespective of its scientific merit. Obviously, the fact of payment by an agency for a research job does not constitute *prima facie* evidence of propaganda research, for many organizations, at least at *particular times*, need "understanding research" rather than "propaganda research." The principle stated here, however, is that, regardless of who his employer may be, an individual is acting as a scientist only at those times when he is engaged in "understanding research."

Repetitious application and scientific scholarship: A second principle has been well stated as follows:

An activity cannot be called research if it simply involves the application of already-proven techniques to a new population (in the statistical sense) . . . If a psychological test has been proven to be useful in determining the degree of mechanical aptitude among machinists, its application to new groups of machinists *ad nauseum* is not research (however useful it might be to the companies employing the machinists). Similarly, the use of a micrometer to check the dimensions of bearings coming from a machine is not research, unless a new variable on which information does not exist has been introduced into the situation and might be expected to vary the results. Both of these illustrations are of inspection processes which have been standardized and proceduralized; there would be no question that the latter example does not constitute research, but many universities are only too glad to regard the former as research to be provided for industrial clients. (1)

The new application of research findings to the solution of practical problems is linked with fundamental research, the repetitions of a

*A revised version of a paper read to the Committee on Standards and Ethics in Research Practice at the meeting of the American Sociological Society held in Berkeley, California, August 30-September 1, 1953, and to the meeting of the International Sociological Association held in Liege, Belgium, September, 1953.

**These questions were raised by Alfred McClung Lee as chairman, Committee on Standards and Ethics in Research Practice, American Sociological Society.

previously applied research procedure are not.

TYPES OF RESEARCH

The easiest problem is that of the academic man who conducts unsupported, unsponsored research. This scholar should have the widest freedom in choice of problem and in its ideologically unencumbered pursuit. He should be free to seek objective knowledge rather than grist for the propagandist's mill; to pursue scholarship rather than repeat routine applications. We are assuming here that he adheres to the canons of scientific research in the design, execution and report of his study and that he feels free to publish his findings without threat of recrimination from interested parties, such as his university administration. Without these prerequisites, even the independent scholar is unable to select his research topics with the freedom necessary for scientific advance.

With the introduction of subsidized research, the problem of independence becomes more crucial. In the following discussion, we shall assume the acceptance of the canons of research and of the two principles stated earlier and shall concentrate upon the special problems of the particular organization.

Academic research bureaus: In this environment, more emphasis should be placed on fundamental and theoretically significant research topics than may be possible in other types of organizations. Projects should not be selected primarily because they meet with the university administration's approval nor should projects of value be dismissed because of the interests of university officials.

If students are involved in the academic research bureau, emphasis should be placed on selecting projects which contribute to their development rather than on projects which mainly contribute to

the survival of the bureau.

Independent non-profit research institutions: A crucial question is the degree of independence of the organization and its researchers from the demands of special interest groups. Some non-profit agencies are not disinterested in their research programs and the researcher who wants to function as a scientist wants to be sure that (a) he can select problems which are meaningful; (b) he can work on a problem without having to provide a particular slant; (c) he can publish his findings irrespective of their nature.

Commercial research agencies: This type of organization creates the most difficulties for the scientist who wishes to act as a scientist. Can a scientist in this organization select significant problems (significant is used here in the sense of activities which are not mere mechanical applications); is he free to work on the problems in accordance with his scientific interests or must he distort his findings to accord with the preconceptions and commercial needs of his sponsors; is the research of an information or a propaganda nature; can he publish his findings irrespective of their content?

Few commercial agencies can afford generally to operate in a way which permits scientific activity. Some agencies need some scientists to develop information research and, in this role, the scientist can perform as a scientist. But only in this role. In the other roles—which I suspect are more frequent in commercial agencies—he is not acting as a scientist, he should not delude himself that he is nor should he mislead the public to believe that he is.

Research department of government, civic organization or business: As with the individual in the commercial agency, the participant must be able to answer "yes" to

the above questions to consider himself a scientist. Particularly difficult is the problem of publication of results which the employer does not wish to publicize.

Perhaps it is better for us to know when our scientific endeavors have ceased and our informed talents are utilized in prescribed ways by particular agencies than to delude ourselves into believing that a *scientific training* insures that all subsequent activity is *scientific activity*.

THE SPONSOR OF RESEARCH

I do not propose a definitive answer but believe it important for social scientists to think of the general problem of sponsorship of research. Can one work as easily for the KKK as for the Social Science Research Council? Undoubtedly, we will agree that the S.S.R.C. is more disinterested and permissive in its license to researchers. Can a scientist work at all for the KKK? I would suggest that, as

a scientist, he cannot because of the interest in propaganda rather than information. But what if the KKK needed—as it does occasionally whether it is aware of this need or not—information research? Could the scientist work for this agency? Substitute for the KKK a variety of less pernicious and more worthy organizations; moving from, say, the McCarthy Subcommittee to an organization like the Petroleum Institute of America or the CIO. Does it matter for whom you work?

In terms of acting as an independent researcher or as a member of an academic research bureau, we can more easily make such decisions. But more and more scientists as scientists must face the issue: can you work for anybody? For whom would you *not* work?

REFERENCE

1. "Research—Business or Scholarship?" unsigned editorial in *Human Organization*, (Fall, 1952).

THE COSTS OF SEGREGATED SCHOOLS

STUART A. QUEEN, MARY FAITH PEILLETT RUSSELL,
VERNON POHLMANN

Washington University

In the spring of 1952 the Committee on Human Rights of the Missouri Association for Social Welfare asked the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Washington University to undertake a study of the costs of segregation in the public schools of Missouri. The purpose was to find answers to these four questions: I) Are Negro and white schools equal? II) What are the direct costs of the schools as now conducted? III) What would be the costs if they were "equal but separate"? IV) What would be the costs if

segregation were abolished and the schools integrated?

ST. LOUIS

I. Are Negro And White Schools Equal?

In the effort to answer this question, we considered the relative maintenance costs of Negro and white schools, the salaries of teachers, the condition of buildings and equipment, and the extent of crowding.

In the elementary schools 33% of the pupils were Negroes, but only 27% of expenditures were de-

voted to their schools. In regular high schools the percentages were 25 and 23. In technical high schools they were 35 and 24.

Next we examined a sample of school buildings and equipment. This sample of elementary schools was chosen with the intention of including one large and one small white school, one large and one small Negro school at the median, at the 1st Quartile, and at the 3rd Quartile. We encountered some difficulties which resulted in a slight variation of the plan, but on the whole it was followed. Both Mrs. Russell and Mr. Pohlmann visited each of the thirteen elementary schools finally chosen, noting in great detail such items as size and lighting of rooms, auxiliary rooms, state of repair, playground equipment, and many others. They conferred with the school principal in nearly every case and checked their ratings against those made independently by the Board of Education.

In general, the Negro schools were found to be inferior to the white schools, but this was most marked in the matter of room crowding. The average for Negro schools was 41 pupils per room; for the white schools, 36. In a few cases we found 50 to 70 pupils in single rooms of Negro schools. Taking 36 as a norm, we may say that 38% of white schools and 88% of Negro schools were overcrowded.

In similar fashion we studied in detail the two Negro high schools and six white high schools. Again differences in equipment, repair, and crowding favored the white schools. In the technical schools discrepancies were greatest of all.

Interestingly, in the matter of teachers' salaries we found no differences when proper allowance was made statistically for education and years of experience.

The answer to the first question is, then, that in St. Louis Negro

and white schools are not equal. However, it should be noted that the differences constitute part of the general community pattern of segregation and discrimination rather than prejudice and deliberate discrimination by the Board of Education.

II. What Do The Schools Cost As Now Conducted?

For the purposes of this brief article we shall not go into an analysis of expenditures except to say that we considered only direct costs which might be affected by the presence or absence of segregation. For the year in question the total came to \$14,500,000.

III. What Would Be The Cost If Schools Were "Equal But Separate?"

The most important single factor affecting our answer to this question pertains to the high schools, and especially to the technical high schools. The most practical method of approximately equalizing the technical and vocational training of Negroes and whites would be (as is actually planned) the erection of a new technical high school for whites in the Southwest part of the city and the conversion of Hadley into a cosmopolitan high school. The cost of the proposed new technical high school was estimated at \$5,935,000. No additional teachers would be required, but there would be additional expenditures for maintenance. On the other hand, the present Negro technical high school could be returned to its original use as an elementary school; hence, we assume no significant change in the cost of instruction and operation. In the elementary schools, we found an excess of 2,800 Negro pupils in the spring of 1952, using 36 pupils per room as a norm. To provide adequately for these children, under segregation, would require the erection of two new buildings of 23

rooms each and two new buildings of 16 rooms each. The cost of these four new schools is conservatively estimated at \$4,800,000. To maintain these new schools would require seventy-eight additional teachers. At the current average salary of Negro teachers, this would cost \$297,000 per year.

To pass over the detailed analysis of the cost of maintenance and operation, let us simply report that to provide approximately "equal but separate" schools for Negro and white students as is now required by the constitution of Missouri, it would cost the city of St. Louis per year \$375,000 for maintenance, \$290,000 for teachers' salaries, or a total of \$665,000. It would require capital outlay, as previously indicated, of \$5,935,000 for a new technical high school and \$4,800,000 for four new elementary schools. This comes to a total of \$10,735,000 of new capital outlay that would be necessary within a very short period of time in order to bring the Negro schools up to approximately the same level as those now occupied by the white schools.

IV. *What Would The Cost Be If The Schools Were Integrated?*

As a means to determining costs of integrated schools we had to determine whether any new buildings and additional teachers would be required. This necessitated checking the capacity of each school building that might be affected and considering the children of school age block by block. By this sort of careful, detailed analysis we established beyond any shadow of a doubt that every child enrolled in elementary public school, white or colored, in the spring of 1952 could have been cared for in a school room without more than 36 pupils. New elementary school districts would have been smaller than the present segregated school districts. No new

buildings would have been immediately required. Those to be erected later to replace obsolete structures could be located more advantageously in terms of long-time usefulness.

To sum up the St. Louis portion of the study, "equal but separate" schools would cost about \$665,000 more per year to operate and would require capital outlay amounting to \$10,735,000. Integrated schools could be operated at the same cost as the present system and would require no capital outlay by reason of the ending of segregation. Over a five-year period the city of St. Louis would save more than \$14,000,000.

OUTSTATE

Because of limited time and funds no other large city was included. Three outstate areas were selected: Butler County, where a considerable number of Negroes are rather highly concentrated; the area around Hannibal, in which Negroes are sparsely settled among white people; and Boone County, which is intermediate both as to density and geographic location. The methods used to determine present costs were approximately the same as those employed in St. Louis.

I. *Are Negro and White Schools Equal?*

From a visit to about 60 rural schools and a smaller number of city schools it was demonstrated that the Negro units were definitely inferior to those for whites.

II. *What Would Costs Be If Schools Were "Equal But Separate"?*

Following procedures similar to those used for St. Louis, we estimated the added cost of building existing school systems in the areas under study up to a status of approximate equality for the two races. We reduced this figure to a per capita difference, which we used as a multiplier with the total

number of Negro pupils in the state, outside of St. Louis and Kansas City, for instructional, maintenance, and operating expenses. We estimated that it would cost \$106,000 a year to make the segregated Negro schools approximately equal to those for whites. But we are painfully aware of the fact that under segregation Negro schools could never be truly equal. Negro children would still have to travel greater distances (we found some making a round trip of 100 miles a day), and it would be impracticable to provide varied high school curricula and equipment for small numbers of Negro children. In addition to current expenses, we estimated that to make the outstate schools for Negroes approximately equal to those for whites would require capital outlays of \$7,135,000.

III. *What Would The Cost Be If Schools Were Integrated?*

Once again we followed procedures in the outstate areas very similar to those used in St. Louis. From the data, carefully assembled district by district, we estimated that for the state as a whole it

would have been possible to save the taxpayers \$1,100,000 per year in current expenditures; and from the sale of old buildings and the avoidance of new construction \$675,000 could have been saved.

SUMMARY FOR FIVE-YEAR PERIOD (Missouri, not including Kansas City)

Summing up the findings of the entire study, the "equal but separate" schools would probably cost over a five-year period \$21,725,000 more than would schools continued on the present unequal basis. If white and Negro schools were integrated, there would be a further saving of \$6,455,000. Thus, the difference between integrated and "equal but separate" is estimated to be \$28,280,000. Since Kansas City has not been included in our study, and since it is unlikely that the drift of differences would be other than those we discovered, we present a final over-all estimate in round numbers of \$30,000,000 as the potential saving in a five-year period, which would accrue to the taxpayers of Missouri if a policy of educational integration were put into effect.

THE DISPROPORTIONATE EMPHASIS ON DESCRIPTION IN SOCIAL PROBLEM TEXTS

ABBOTT P. HERMAN

University of Redlands

To demonstrate that there is disproportionate emphasis on description in the presentation of social problems, the number of pages of major publications devoted to this and other emphases was measured. For this purpose well-known multiple-problems books and one-problem texts, appearing since 1930, were used. (1)

Emphases. Three kinds of em-

phasis were established—description, analysis, and treatment. Description was interpreted to mean the form a problem takes; incidence; locale; ecological distribution; the effects of the problem; the costs, etc. Descriptive data do not deal with causes as such, although they may suggest causes.

Description deals with the *what* of the problem, analysis with the

why of the problem. Analysis was defined to mean theories explaining how the problem developed. The causal analysis usually takes the form of (a) attempts to account for the problem in terms of personality disorders, family situations, play or companionship group influences, and ecological areas or (b) explorations of the deep-rooted factors of culture, such as the values of social institutions, the changes or instruments of change, the direction the values give to change, and other types of underlying cultural elements.

Treatment we took to mean community resources for dealing with the problem, programs of public and private agencies, in fact, any proposals for "solving" the problem, whether or not they were feasible.

Measuring the emphases: Not every chapter of the multiple-problems books was examined. Inasmuch as nine problems were found to be most frequently discussed, these were chosen to constitute the sample. These (in order of their frequency) are crime, delinquency, mental disorders, race conflict, family breakdown, alcoholism, unemployment, sex offences, political corruption.

In the multiple-problems texts the proportion of pages given to description averaged 48%; to analysis, 30%; to treatment, 21%. In the books stressing but one problem, 53% of the pages were given to description, 26% to analysis, 21% to treatment. If the non-analytical emphases, like description and treatment, are compared with the analytical, the authors' concern with non-causal data, at least as expressed by the number of pages, is about three times as great as with causes. And if one looks for discussion of more basic causes, i.e., the underlying cultural processes, the gap between the non-analytical

and analytical emphases is even more marked.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE EMPHASIS ON DESCRIPTION

Exposure and awareness, early objectives: The latter half of the last and early part of the present century saw the eruption of many different kinds of problems in newly-industrialized urban America. (7) This was reflected in the demand for social reform, for progressivism in politics, for muckraking in journalism, for the social gospel in liberal Protestantism, for the humanitarian approach to life.

The demand upon early sociology was that it expose the problems of society and give data about them. This produced a trend toward "investigations" and "surveys."

The elementary social problems course today, while not motivated by exactly the same considerations, follows more or less the same pattern. College instructors present many different types of problems, their severity, their reach and magnitude, their impact upon persons and groups, their costs. Publishing company agents say that instructors will not adopt a social problems text unless it contains a wide assortment of problems. If the problems are dramatically portrayed, all the better. From this kind of awareness, it is hoped, will come the desire to do something about the problems.

It is true, however, that social problems books of the last five or ten years have shown increasing leanings toward analysis. One evidence of this is the growing contempt for reform. Many social scientists now contend that reformism is guided more by zeal than by rational understanding—and that rational understanding requires more than mere description. (4)

Yet, in spite of the growing conviction that analysis of causes in

terms of cultural roots is essential, social problems books and courses remain more or less as they were. Sociologists are of two minds on the matter: on the one hand, they see the need for more analytical data, on the other hand, they do not want to relinquish the fascinating excursion into the drama of social problems, especially one that pays off so well in large enrollments of students.

Detailed description essential for analysis: Those who defend the time and space given to description make the point that, in order to adduce causes, it is necessary to have much descriptive data. (2) This is true, but we now have so much of the same sort of data on the same old problems that we may have reached a point of diminishing returns. What is recommended here is not necessarily a reduction in the volume of descriptive data, but an increase in the attention given to analysis so that a better balance may be achieved.

SHOULD THERE BE GREATER STRESS ON ANALYSIS?

Understanding of problems requires probing into cultural roots: Most cultural anthropologists and sociologists maintain that problems, social and personal, come out of the deep-seated elements of culture. In the consideration of problems what has the sociologist done to make good that claim?

The recognition in recent books of the need for a theoretical framework in attacking problems is a step in this direction. Approaches called cultural lag, institutional failure to control change, social disorganization, value-conflicts, social deviations, are systems of thought, theoretical frameworks of analysis, to advance basic understanding of problems.

After arriving at this stage, the next is carefully to examine the elements which make up the under-

lying cultural process. But except for a very few instances this has not been done. Can and should it be done?

After attempting a study of social problems in which the major emphasis was put on analysis, the writer was charged with failure to realize the objectives of the social problems course. (3) If the primary purpose in teaching social problems is description, then the criticism may have some point. But if the primary purpose is an understanding of basic causes so that students may adequately cope with problems, then we should compromise by expanding the analytical material without sacrificing descriptive data. If it is impossible to do both with the usual assortment of social problems, then perhaps we should reduce the number of problems in our social problems texts.

Basic analysis helps in treating the problem: One question which frequently arises is whether there is point in delving into cultural processes if the problem is already here. The answer is that this knowledge does or should contribute to our treatment of problems. After all, the problem-producing process is an ongoing one, and if problems are to be prevented, the elements of this process must be recognized and understood. A growing community could theoretically be planned so that some of the problems which ordinarily crop out at the end of ten, fifteen or twenty years would be forestalled. A grasp of the institutional values involved in bringing about our problems might cause us to concentrate on changing those values and by that means reducing the number and severity of problems. For example, the realization that certain types of ecological areas are unnecessary—that planning can create conditions which will not nourish delinquency, family breakdown, race conflict,

and mental disorder—would be a preventive and fundamental approach to problem therapy.

It should be said at once that in embarking upon this approach the sociologist does not necessarily imply that certain values have to be espoused or that he has to become a reformer. He sees the values in the underlying process not in terms of his own convictions but in terms of the dominant values of the society. He uncovers what the society desires and why it does not realize its desires.

The advantages of prevention: Reference has been made to the need for prevention of problems. Underlying most problems books is a philosophy of cure rather than of prevention. We are repair-minded. When the problem does crop out, we usually deal with it on an individualized basis, through the special services of some agency. Or if we do not deal directly with the individual affected by the problem, we attack the more superficial causes. In either case, we find ourselves in the position of putting a poultice on the wounded area, of doing too little too late. Sutherland, Ogburn, Lynd, Plant and others have shown the wastefulness, the inefficiency of that approach. (5) Attacking the problem after it has become manifest and unduly severe (society usually does not take action until the problem reaches emergency proportions) involves the creation of many different types of services and agencies which duplicate effort, raise costs and magnify the public debt. Furthermore, permanent "cures" are few and the recurrence percentage is high. (6)

There is no denying the size and involvement of an undertaking that would seek to prevent problems. What it would amount to is large-scale cultural reorganization. Assuming this to be feasible, the first task would be to make analysis so

detailed and so refined as to provide a sound base for cultural reorganization. Here the great importance of a suitable framework for the analysis of problems becomes apparent. A suitable framework is one which could be broken down into a large number of research undertakings to yield an over-all blueprint for projects extending over many years.

But to revert to an earlier point: the present state of sociological analysis of problems is not in sufficient volume or detail to call for such action. Yet, it is this kind of analysis to which the sociologist aspires when he speaks of the deep-rooted cultural causes of our disturbances. If the sociologist were to take his own convictions and aspirations more seriously, he would be devoting more time and space to analysis of basic causes, even if at this stage he had to neglect description.

As the late Dr. James Plant pointed out in his *Personality and the Cultural Pattern*, the sciences of behavior must arrive at a preventive approach. Medicine is slowly undergoing this shift in emphasis. The cost of waiting for problems to turn up and then "muddling through" is neither good sense nor good science.

REFERENCES

1. Multiple-problems books: Harry Elmer Barnes, *Society in Transition*, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939; Jessie Bernard, *American Community Behavior*, New York: The Dryden Press, 1949; Lawrence Guy Brown, *Social Pathology*, New York: F. S. Crofts and Co., 1946; John F. Cuber and Robert A. Harper, *Problems of American Society*, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1948; Mabel A. Elliott and Francis E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950; Robert E. L. Faris, *Social Disorganization*, New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948; James Ford, *Social Deviation*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939; John Morris Gillette and James M. Reinhardt, *Current Social Problems*, New York: American Book Co., 1933;

John Lewis Gillin, Clarence G. Dittmer and Roy J. Colbert, *Social Problems*, New York: The Century Co., 1943; Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth Briant Lee, *Social Problems in America*, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1949; Edwin M. Lemert, *Social Pathology*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1951; Francis E. Merrill, *Social Problems*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950; John Eric Nordskog, Edward C. McDonagh and Melvin J. Vincent, *Analyzing Social Problems*, New York: The Dryden Press, 1950; Stuart A. Queen, Walter B. Bodenhafer and Ernest B. Harper, *Social Organization and Disorganization*, New York: The Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1935; Wallace W. Weaver, *Social Problems*, New York: William Sloane Associates, 1951.

One-problem texts: Nels Anderson, *Men on the Move*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940; Harry Elmer Barnes, Negley K. Teeters, *New Horizons in Criminology*, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951; Brewton Berry, *Race Relations*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951; Dorothy Bromley and Florence Britten, *Youth and Sex*, New York: Harper and Bros., 1938; Ruth S. Cavan, *Criminology*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1948; Ruth Shonle Cavan and Katherine Howland Ranck, *The Family and the Depression*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938; Paul Cressey, *The Taxi-Dance Hall*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932; St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1945; Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, *500 Delinquent Women*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934; Alfred McClung Lee and Norman D. Humphrey, *Race Riot*, New York: The Dryden Press, 1943; Walter C. Reckless, *Vice in Chicago*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930; Lemo Theresa Rockwood and Mary E. N. Ford, *Youth, Marriage and Parenthood*, New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1945; Clifford R. Shaw, Henry D. McKay and James F. McDonald, *Brothers in Crime*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938; Clif-

ford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay, *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942; Clifford R. Shaw, *Natural History of a Delinquent Career*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931; Edwin H. Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology*, New York: Lippincott Co., 1947; Frederick Milton Thrasher, *The Gang*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946; Paul W. Tappan, *Juvenile Delinquency*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949; W. F. Whyte, *Street Corner Society*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

2. For a stimulating discussion of this and related questions see Theodore Abel, "The Present Status of Social Theory," *American Sociological Review*, 17, (April, 1952), 156-167.

3. John F. Cuber. Review of Abbott P. Herman, *An Approach to Social Problems*, in the *Annals of the American Academy of Social Science*, 264 (July, 1949), 182.

4. Richard C. Fuller, "Sociological Theory and Social Problems," *Social Forces*, XV, 4 (May, 1937), pp. 496-502; Abbott P. Herman, *An Approach to Social Problems*, Boston: Ginn & Co., 1949, Chap. I.

5. Robert S. Lynd, *Knowledge For What?*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939, Chaps. I, V; Robert S. Lynd, "The Implications of Economic Planning," *American Sociological Review*, IX (Feb., 1944), 14-20; National Resources Committee, *Technological Trends and National Policy*, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939, Sections 1 and 2.

6. Edwin H. Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology*, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939, pp. 613, 620; James S. Plant, *Personality and the Cultural Pattern*, New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1937.

7. Harvey W. Zorbaugh, *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929, Chap. XII.

BOOK REVIEWS

Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Edited by DORWIN CARTWRIGHT and ALVIN ZANDER. White Plains, New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1953. xiii, 642 pp. \$6.00.

This volume is perhaps the best over-all treatment of the significant work that has been going on in the area of Group Dynamics in recent years. It presents a collection of studies under six general headings: Approaches to the Study of Groups, Group Cohesiveness, Group Pressures and Group Standards, Group Goals and Group Locomotion, The Structural Properties of Groups, and Leadership.

Each section is introduced by an essay on the topic prepared by Cartwright and Zander. These introductions add immeasurably to the value of the book, for they place the following papers in perspective and also relate them to other research documents not included in this collection. Reading of the introduction suggests that work in this field has been progressing a good deal more systematically than might appear from casual perusal of the scattered articles.

The collection contains such Group Dynamics old stand-bys as the White and Lippett autocracy-democracy study, the Coch and French report on experiments in the Harwood Manufacturing Company, and the Lewin discussion of group decisions. There are also more recent pieces by those identified with the Lewin group: Lippett, French, Festinger, Schachter and Bevelas. However, the volume is not limited to those commonly identified with Kurt Lewin. It includes three chapters on various phases of R. Freed Bales' interaction process analysis, a statement on sociometry by Helen Jennings, a report on studies of leadership

in industry by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn, as well as several other significant studies.

While we may welcome this broadening of the conception of Group Dynamics so as to cover any significant studies of groups, we may question the criteria of significance used by the editors. As they say (p. xi) "With a few exceptions, we have included only reports that present empirical findings based upon quantitative research . . ."

This has meant a heavy concentration upon laboratory experiments. Some (but by no means all) of these experiments involve the following conditions: (1) the subjects have no pre-established relations with each other, (2) communication among them is limited to written messages, and (3) the tasks imposed for the "group" are distinctly artificial in the sense that the individuals would not be engaging in such activities in the ordinary course of events.

From these experimental studies we would like to be able to predict behavior in the field situations that we most commonly encounter where precisely the opposite conditions prevail: (1) the people observed know each other and have an established pattern of interaction, (2) communication is not limited to written messages and may in fact take place predominantly in oral form, and (3) the people are engaged in tasks which form a normal part of their daily activities.

In such cases there is such a great gap between laboratory and the field that we must be very wary in drawing any field conclusions from the laboratory findings.

The obvious answer to this criticism is that the laboratory findings must be checked against field experiment and observations. This is a good answer, but it throws into

question the whole emphasis given by the editors in this book. They seem to be assuming that scientific knowledge will progress most rapidly when the early stages of our group studies are devoted primarily to laboratory experimentation. On the contrary, I suggest that our knowledge of groups will progress more rapidly if field studies and laboratory experimentation proceed side by side.

This brings us to the perhaps pious conclusion that the Group Dynamics people should place a much heavier emphasis upon field studies. On the other hand, the book also clearly indicates that sociologists have much to learn from the laboratory experiments so ably represented here.

We grow out of different scientific traditions. For the Group Dynamics people, the laboratory experiment is the real thing and that is the method in which they are particularly trained. Most sociologists (including this reviewer) are completely baffled by the task of placing their research problems in this sort of laboratory framework and are inclined to concentrate exclusively on field studies. If, as it should be, the scientific problem really determines the research methods we use, then we should find in the future more investigations which involve both laboratory and field studies.

W. F. WHYTE

*New York School of
Industrial and Labor Relations,
Cornell University*

The Tools of Social Science. By JOHN MADGE. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953. x, 308 pp. \$4.75.

In 1950 Barbara Wootton published her *Testament for Social Science*, a call from England to apply the scientific method to hu-

man problems. The book was marred to some extent by an unfamiliarity with the American literature and by an emphasis upon program rather than upon performance. These deficiencies are wholly rectified in this second book on the subject to reach us from England within a short period of time.

John Madge (who is not further identified either by himself or by his publishers) is a sophisticated observer of the contemporary sociological scene. He is sadly aware of the fact that the great hope of Comte to establish a science of society, a hope now over one hundred years old, has not been fulfilled. He knows that the underlying principles of social science are only "precariously established" and that the theoretical foundations of research are far from secure. He appreciates the harsh epistemological fact that the utilization of sense experience itself depends upon presuppositions which escape the possibility of empirical proof. And he asks us always to recognize "the insidious control of our perceptions by our purposes."

In his initial chapter Mr. Madge discusses with competence and care some of the problems of logic, language, and statistics in their relationship to sociological research. Succeeding chapters deal in detail with practical procedures and techniques—documents, observation, interviews (including "the mass interview" or what we should call attitude testing and poll-taking), and experiment. On all of these subjects the author is unusually perceptive and incisive. He is inconclusive only in his conclusion, a short chapter on the limits of social science in which he confesses to a certain depression over the results of a century of sociological research and over his own survey of the methods employed. He retains, nevertheless, a cautious optimism in his belief that we can develop,

if not "watertight theories," at least realistic and sensible solutions to some of the social problems which confront a torn and tormented world.

ROBERT BIERSTEDT

The City College of New York

The Battle for Mental Health.

By JAMES CLARK MOLONEY. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 105 pp. \$3.50.

The Psychology and Psychotherapy of Otto Rank; An Historical and Comparative Introduction.

By FAY B. KARPF. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. xii, 129 pp. \$3.00.

Dr. Moloney's loosely organized little book presents some reflections on mental health and cites statistics showing the high incidence, in the United States, of mental illness, crime, divorce, alcoholism, drug addiction, and suicide. A discussion of how "American culture disturbs mental health" centers on the relationship of mother to child and emphasizes the need for "warmth" in that relationship. This discussion sets the stage for the second half of the book, which presents the aims of the Cornelian Corner (an organization established in Detroit in 1942, designed to "promote healthy parent-child relationships") and launches into a criticism of the current maternity practices of hospitals. Writing of modern hospital personnel, and including obstetricians and maternity nurses, the author observes: "One of the greatest problems that confronts us today is how to get the new-born out of the clutches of these machines-masquerading-as-human-beings before they succeed in implementing the mother's pre-existing inefficacy and catapult the new-born into

character rigidity, psychosomatic disease, or even madness." The impression rendered is that character structure is ineluctably formed in the earliest nursery days. This reviewer remains unconvinced that failure to practice rooming-in is as fraught with horrible psychic consequences as Dr. Moloney has apparently persuaded himself that it is. This volume is a frail item indeed for the rather portentous title it bears.

The psychology of Otto Rank is reviewed by Fay Karpf against a background of the theories of Freud, Jung, and Adler. Dr. Karpf's claims in favor of Rank are measured and relatively modest. She concedes the currently controversial nature of the specifically psychotherapeutic field and does not deny that, as a systematic thinker and theorist, Rank will hardly bear comparison with the other three outstanding psychiatrists. Yet, despite the unexceptionally restrained tone of her book, it is somewhat disappointing. Rank had many pungent remarks to make about the Freudian therapeutic procedures. It would have been a real service to collate, focus, and systematize such remarks. They could then, of course, be more carefully and seriously considered. Whatever the shortcomings of Sebastian de Grazia's recent *Errors of Psychotherapy*, it has the considerable merit of relative unambiguity in its onslaughts on therapy. Rank's forays might conceivably have been given a similar tightness and sharpness of outline. But it was evidently Dr. Karpf's primary purpose to stimulate further consideration of Rank's general views. She, or others, may now be inspired to carry on beyond this point.

LOUIS SCHNEIDER

Purdue University

Solitude and Privacy; A Study of Social Isolation, Its Causes and Therapy. By PAUL HALMOS. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. xxvii, 181 pp. \$4.75.

This slim volume is both a notable contribution to our understanding of a basic area of human behavior, and a first rate example of social psychological research. The interrelationships between theoretical analysis and empirical findings are beautifully displayed, not abstractly or self-consciously, but with reference to a substantive problem, namely the desocialization of man. Halmos' major thesis is that there has been a trend toward desocialization which "consists in the reduction of modes and opportunities of social participation."

The major psychological consequence for individuals, who live in a society where genuine gregariousness is devalued and takes the form of a compulsive pseudosociability while privacy and reserve is overly valued, is a tendency towards neurotic anxiety. Tendencies toward desocialization are further analyzed in relation to ideologies and value systems. Halmos' view is that "individual rationalisations of man's withdrawal from the social world are mere concretisations of an already available ideological structure, and that the intra-psychic

motivations for such unsociable behavior could also be traced back to the domination of separative ideologies."

By means of a historical analysis of typical patterns of desocialization and discussion of institutional and ideological elements, the author's attitude-survey findings are given added relevance. The surveys were designed to test the relationship between isolation and anxiety, and the research is especially noteworthy in that use is made of replication as a means of further validation of hypotheses. Replication while commonplace among researches in the physical sciences is still sufficiently rare in the behavior sciences to rate a special mention.

Halmos further extends his work by an analysis of social reform and social therapy, and concludes with a discussion of the role of the sociologist as diagnostician, analyst, and guide to social reality. This book, the author's doctoral dissertation at the University of London, will repay careful reading and re-reading by all persons who are interested in the psychology of loneliness, isolation, and privacy.

ISRAEL GERVER

*Probation Department,
Court of General Sessions,
New York City.*

OFFICIAL REPORTS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY HELD IN BERKELEY, AUGUST 29—SEPTEMBER 1, 1953

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETINGS

Saturday, August 29, 1953, Ernest W. Burgess, Presiding.

TREASURER'S REPORT (read by the Secretary in the absence of James B. McKee): Income for the fiscal year, \$882.45. This total does not include the sums collected and disbursed in connection with the second annual meeting at Atlantic City and the mid-winter joint conference with SPSSI at New York University. Total expenditures, \$634.13, leaving a balance of \$248.32. A large part of the expenditures, \$506.32, was incidental to the first issue of *SOCIAL PROBLEMS*.

REPORT OF THE MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE (read by the Secretary in absence of Paul Walter, Jr., Committee Chairman): The total active membership at the end of the fiscal year was 202. Although this is a substantial growth in two years, the Chairman urged as a goal the doubling of the membership during the coming year.*

REPORT OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (read by Richard A. Schermerhorn, Chairman). Names of officers and elected committee members for the year 1953-1954 are printed elsewhere in this journal.

REPORT OF THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE (read by Alfred M. Lee, Chairman): Arrangements are being made for the 1954 Annual Meeting and for the joint conference with SPSSI. Both meetings are announced elsewhere in this issue.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE. In the absence of the Chairman, Arnold M. Rose, who was in Europe, it was reported that work is continuing on the book of readings on the *Sociology of Mental Health and Mental Disorder*.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND FREEDOM OF RESEARCH PUBLICATION, AND TEACHING. (Report submitted by the Chairman, Harold L. Sheppard, and read in his ab-

sence by the Secretary): It was recommended that discussion be continued by the new committee on the following items:

1. The professional ethics involved in the relationship between the research staff and the sponsors of a project.
2. The extent to which social scientists in their teaching anticipate censure or repression of ideas with consequent limitation upon their expression.
3. The extent to which informal pressures are exerted on research and writing by the desire to gain recognition and status, and how this affects the study of social problems.
4. To what extent research in social problems is directed along lines which "sell" rather than in terms of the importance of the social problems studied.
5. Whether the current stress upon research activities may lead to the neglect of the teaching function of the social problems expert.
6. The extent to which the findings of the research worker are influenced by the source of the funds.
7. Ways in which social scientists themselves may assist in the fight against totalitarianism, without succumbing to the undesirable features usually associated with such attempts.
8. How would a study aimed at the above and related problems be designed if the SSSP were to receive a grant to study the extent to which academic freedom is being jeopardized?

The report recommended that steps should be taken to approach a foundation with such a project in mind.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (read by the Chairman-elect Alfred M. Lee). Announcement of the appointment of committee chairmen and members of the committees.

A letter from Arnold M. Rose was read stating that SSSP had been invited to membership in the International Sociological Association. A motion was passed to authorize the action taken by Arnold M. Rose and Jessie Bernard in accepting membership on behalf of the Society.

Monday, August 31, Discussion after the Informal Supper, Richard A. Schermerhorn Presiding.

Following are the suggestions made by

* By the end of December, 1953 the membership was well beyond 500.

the five discussion groups dealing with the question, "What should be the Society's program and activities?"

1. SSSP should seek to develop cooperation and integration among the separate specialties studying social problems.
2. Study the resistances to attempted solutions of social problems.
3. Make a survey of studies already available seeking to determine what important types of social problems are not being dealt with adequately.
4. Develop projects by teams along the lines of the Mental Health and Mental Disease project.
5. Develop specific ways of getting teachers and students interested in the program of the Society.
6. Consider the vulnerability of people who engage in the study of social problems. In this connection there might well be a statement of obligations and privileges of members of SSSP.
7. Consider the role of sociologists in examining value judgments, and the role of sociologists in establishing social policy.

Individual members made additional suggestions and raised questions: What is the field of social problems? Wouldn't it be desirable to analyze textbooks in social problems to study their coverage? Would it be desirable to prepare a sociologist's statement of ethical principles, derived by summarizing the answers to open-ended questions submitted to our members?

Program and Policy Discussion Session, Ernest W. Burgess, Presiding.

Herbert Blumer reported on the status of SSSP's application for affiliation with the American Sociological Society. There is to be a referendum on affiliation. For this referendum, a special Sociological Society committee headed by Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., is preparing a statement of the facts and issues to submit to the membership of the American Sociological Society..

Alfred M. Lee reported on the Society's journal *SOCIAL PROBLEMS*, in the absence of Jerome Himelhoch, the Editor. The October and January issues will be similar in organization to the first issue. Following will be an issue devoted in large part to the second Kinsey report. The staff is being built up, consulting editors are being added, and it is planned to expand the advertising. The editor wishes to call to the Society's attention the invaluable services of Associate Editors Sidney H. Aronson, Sylvia Fleis Fava, and Nathan L. Gerrard and of the Book

Review Editor, Samuel Koenig.

The editor is encouraged by the quality and quantity of articles submitted. The response that greeted the first issue shows the need for *SOCIAL PROBLEMS*.

The Society has managed and can continue to publish *SOCIAL PROBLEMS* in its present size and format on its income, but this is due in large part to the fact that so many members have been willing to contribute generously of their time. It will be necessary to obtain new members, and all members should encourage their libraries to subscribe.

Because of the interdisciplinary approach of the journal, members should solicit subscriptions from psychologists, anthropologists, economists, political scientists, and historians as well as from sociologists.

DISCUSSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND FREEDOM OF RESEARCH, PUBLICATION, AND TEACHING. The following motion was passed:

To charge the newly elected committee to undertake the preparation of a preliminary code of ethics for students of social problems.

After further discussion of the report of the 1952-1953 Committee, the following motion was passed:

To lay the report on the table, and ask the Committee for the new year to submit a report and have a representative present at the next annual meeting to discuss proposals that may be made.

NEW BUSINESS. The question of getting students interested in the program of SSSP was discussed. It was pointed out that there is a lack of participation by young, skilled persons in the solution of social problems. The members agreed that it would be desirable to have new demonstrations on several campuses, under direction of officers of the Society, of how students may be drawn into the study of social problems. The following motion was passed:

That the Membership Committee develop ways to interest undergraduate students in the study of social problems, and in the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

The following motion was also passed: That the Executive Committee be authorized to set up special committees to deal with the interests of various groups concerned with the scientific study of social problems, as such committees may be needed.

Respectfully submitted,
Byron L. Fox, Secretary

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS 1953 - 1954

Membership Committee:

Erwin O. Smigel, Indiana University,
Chairman;
Theodore F. Abel, Hunter College;
Stuart N. Adams, Human Resources Research Institute;
Francis R. Allen, Florida State University, Tallahassee;
William B. Baker, Regina, Sask.;
Modene Bates, San Diego, Calif.;
Raymond A. Bauer, Harvard University;
Seymour S. Bellin, New York State Mental Health Commission;
Peter M. Blau, University of Chicago;
Samuel W. Blizzard, Union Theological Seminary, New York;
Robert Boguslaw, The RAND Corporation;
Warren Breed, Newcomb College, Tulane University;
Max N. Burchard, University of Omaha;
Charles G. Chakerian, Hartford Seminary Foundation;
Stanley H. Chapman, University of Bridgeport;
W. F. Cottrell, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio;
Margret Leone Davis, Chattanooga, Tenn.;
Edwin D. Driver, University of Massachusetts;
Frieda Fligelman, Institute of Social Logic, Helena, Montana;
Noel P. Gist, University of Missouri;
Abbott P. Herman, University of Redlands;
Mozell C. Hill, Atlanta University;
Rex D. Hopper, Brooklyn College;
Paul Houser, Kent State University;
Helen Hall Jennings, Brooklyn College;
Haitung King, Kansas Wesleyan University;
Frank F. Lee, Northeastern University;
Rose Hum Lee, Roosevelt College;
Myron F. Lewis, American University;
Eugene P. Link, State University of New York, New Paltz;
A. Raymond Mangus, Ohio State University;
James E. McKewen, DePaul University;
Annabelle Bender Motz, University of Maryland;
Wayne C. Neely, Hood College;
Paul M. Neurath, Queens College;
Charles H. Page, Smith College;
Austin L. Porterfield, Texas Christian University;
Arthur E. Prell, University of New Hampshire;
James M. Reinhardt, University of Nebraska;
Bernard Rosenberg, Brandeis University;

Jay Rumney, Rutgers University, Newark;
Julian Samora, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado;
Donald D. Stewart, University of Arkansas;
Frederic W. Terrian, San Francisco State College;
Paul A. Thomas, DePauw University;
Nicholas S. Timasheff, Fordham University;
Albert D. Ullman, Tufts College;
Preston Valien, Fish University;
Max Wolff, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Committee on Liaison With Other Organizations:

Herbert Blumer, University of California, Berkeley, Chairman;
Don J. Hager, American Jewish Congress;
Robert Cuba Jones, United Nations;
Hertha Kraus, Bryn Mawr College;
Simon Marcson, American Jewish Committee;
Emanuel Muravchik, Jewish Labor Committee;
S. S. Sargent, Barnard College, Columbia University;
Ralph H. Turner, University of California, Los Angeles.

Elections Committee:

James B. McKee, Oberlin College, Chairman;
Herbert A. Bloch, St. Lawrence University;
Carroll D. Clark, University of Kansas;
Milton M. Gordon, Haverford College;
J. S. Himes, Jr., North Carolina College, Durham;
Guy B. Johnson, University of North Carolina;
Richard A. Schermerhorn, Western Reserve University.

New Projects Committee:

Paul Meadows, University of Nebraska, Chairman;
James Luther Adams, University of Chicago;
Abraham Citron, American Jewish Congress;
Thomas Dawes Eliot, Northwestern University;
Howard E. Jensen, Duke University;
S. Michael Miller, Brooklyn College;
Dorothy Krall Newman, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics;
Wellman J. Warner, New York University.

Program Committee:

Paul Oren, Jr., Kent State University,
Chairman;
Franz Adler, University of Arkansas;
Thomas L. Blair, Michigan State College;
Winston W. Ehrmann, University of
Florida, Gainesville;
Sherwood D. Fox, New York University;
Alfred R. Lindesmith, Indiana University;
Francis E. Merrill, Dartmouth College;
Martin H. Neumeyer, University of
Southern California;
Austin L. Porterfield, Texas Christian
University;
Harry W. Roberts, Virginia State College,
Petersburg;

Shirley A. Star, National Opinion Re-
search Center, University of Chicago.

**Special Joint Conference Committee
of SPSSI and SSSP:**

Gerhart David Wiebe, Columbia Broad-
casting System, Chairman;
Robert Bierstedt, City College of New
York;
S. Michael Miller, Brooklyn College;
Paul Oren, Jr., Kent State University,
(Chairman, SSSP Program Committee,
ex-officio)
Other SPSSI members to be announced.

NOTICE OF 1954 ANNUAL MEETING

The next annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems is to be held at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, in conjunction with the meeting of the American Sociological Society (September 8-10) and on the following day, September 11. The Presidential Dinner and two program sessions (Social Disorganization, Robert E. L. Paris of the University of Washington, Chairman, and International Tensions, Barrington Moore, Jr. of Harvard University, Chairman) will be sponsored jointly by the two societies. Interested members of SSSP are urged to contribute papers to the joint sessions.

The program of the September meeting, as now conceived, will be directed toward increasing our awareness of problem areas, and toward providing an opportunity for free communication in our fields of specialization. Panel discussions by experts are planned on such questions of general interest as the relationship of sociology to ethics, anti-intellectualism, the graduate student's view of the field

of sociology, and social conditions related to the development of mental health. Suggestions as to possible participants on these panels would be appreciated by the Program Committee.

Informal meetings on special problem areas (to be determined by the expressed interest of the membership) will be scheduled, thus providing an opportunity for communication within areas of specialization. In addition, each group will discuss the advisability of instituting some continuing form of organization directed toward the evaluation and development of that particular field. (It is hoped that such committees eventually will produce publications.) Those interested in the organization of one or more of these groups are requested to submit 150-word statements of their research interests; these statements, along with introductory statements by the temporary chairmen of the groups, will be mimeographed and made available at the registration desk.

Paul Oren, Jr., Kent State University,
Chairman, The Program Committee

Official Reports

PROGRAM OF SECOND JOINT CONFERENCE OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND THE SOCIETY FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ISSUES

February 27-28, 1954, at the Henry Hudson Hotel, New York City*

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27

10 A.M.-12:45 P.M. **The Role of Foundations and Government in the Social Sciences.** Chairman: Stuart Cook, New York University. Speakers: Bernard Berelson, Ford Foundation; Leo Lowenthal, Voice of America.

2:15-5 P.M. **Historical Perspective: Speech and Association in Relation to Patriotism.** Chairman: S. Stansfeld Sargent, Columbia University. Speakers: H. H. Wilson, Princeton University; Bert James Lowenberg, Sarah Lawrence College.

8-10 P.M. **Power.** Chairman: Eugene Hartley, City College of New York. Speaker: to be announced.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 28

10 A.M.-12:45 P.M. **Current Issues in Academic Freedom.** Chairman: Alfred McClung Lee, Brooklyn College. Speaker: George Stoddard, Chairman of Directing Committee, New York University's Self-Study. Discussants: H. H. Wilson, Princeton University; Bert James Lowenberg, Sarah Lawrence College.

2:15-5 P.M. **The Relation of Research to Problems of War and Peace.** Chairman: Theodore F. Abel, Hunter College. Speakers: Herbert C. Kelman, Johns Hopkins University; Robert C. Angell, University of Michigan; W. F. Cottrell, Miami University.

*Readers may make their reservations at the Henry Hudson Hotel for Saturday, February 27, on the card enclosed with this journal.

The Social Psychology of Prejudice

by
**Gerhart
Saenger**

N.Y.U.

\$4.00

at your bookstore
or from

**HARPER
&
BROTHERS**

ACHIEVING INTERCULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

Here for the first time the growing body of scientific knowledge concerning race and ethnic relations is integrated and distilled into a single volume. Written especially for educational use, it offers factual ammunition for combating prejudice in personal as well as organizational efforts.

"... it brings into clear focus the knowledge we now have about the misconceptions, illusions, and false-prides that poison the relations of men ... The knowledge it contains needs to be spread far and wide."—R. M. MacIVER

When writing advertisers please mention SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

Encyclopedia of ABERRATIONS

A PSYCHIATRIC HANDBOOK

Edited by EDWARD PODOLSKY, M.D.
Kings County Hospital Psychiatric Staff

With a Foreword by ALEXANDRA ADLER, M.D.
New York University College of Medicine

This is the first systematic exposition of human aberrational behavior. In this volume over fifty eminent psychologists and psychiatrists discuss all types of aberrations, with particular emphasis on their psychodynamics. The material is arranged in alphabetical sequence for easy reference.

SOME OF THE ENTRIES:

Abasia	Ecstasy, artificial	Logorrhea
Ablutomania	Erotographomania	Lying
Abulia	Exhibitionism	Malingering
Acalculia	Family tension	Masochism
Acataphasia	Fellatio	Menstrual anomalies
Aggression	Fetishism	Mescaline intoxication
Alcoholism	Folie a deux	Murderer, mind of
Amnesia	Frigidity	Mutism
Anal eroticism	Frottage	Mysophobia
Anancasm	Gambling	Narcolepsy
Anti-Semitic attitudes	Gammacism	Necrophilia
Anxiety, dental	Gelasmus	Negativism
Aphasia and linguistics	Gustatory sweating	Nudism
Autism, infantile	Gynephobia	Nymphomania
Auto-punishment	Hair-plucking	Ochlophobia
Benzedrine, addiction	Hallucinations	Onanism
Bestiality	Haptodysphoria	Opium, addiction
Body image disturbances	Hashish, addiction	Pavor nocturnus
Boredom	Head banging	Pessimism
Brontophobia	Heroin, addiction	Pethidine, addiction
Cacodaemonomania	Heterolalia	Phobias
Chloral delirium	Homosexuality	Pornography
Choreomania	Hysteria	Psychosis
Clairvoyance	Iconolagny	Puberty, aberrational
Claustrophobia	Illusions	Sadism
Cocaine, addiction	Inferiority feelings	Schizophrenia
Crime, neurotic	Intellectual malfunctioning	Somnambulism
Criminality	Kainotophobia	Sophomania
Depression	Kakorrhaphiophobia	Suicide
Devil worship	Kleptomania	Therioanthropy
Dream murders	Language frustration	Xenophobia
Dysprosody	Laughter, fits of	Zoophilism
Ecouleur	Lesbianism	

OVER HALF A MILLION WORDS

\$10.00

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Publishers

15 East 40th St., Desk 647

New York 16, N. Y.

Expedite shipment by prepayment

When writing advertisers please mention SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

For the serious student of the social sciences, there is no substitute for reading Free Press books. This winter and spring will mark the publication of theoretical, empirical and methodological works which are destined to take their place in the permanent reference literature of the social sciences.

MATHEMATICAL THINKING IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Edited by Paul F. Lazarsfeld
February, \$10.00

STUDIES IN THE SCOPE AND METHOD OF 'THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY'

Edited by Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda
January, \$4.50

PATTERNS OF INDUSTRIAL BUREAUCRACY

By Alvin Gouldner
February, \$4.50

AN INDEX OF SOCIAL TENSION

By Shirley A. Star
May, \$5.00

THE NEGRO PROFESSIONAL CLASS

By G. Franklin Edwards
March, \$3.50

CONFLICT AND MOOD: Factors Affecting The Stability of Response

By Patricia Kendall
March, \$5.00

THE FOCUSSED INTERVIEW

Revised 1954
By Robert K. Merton
March, \$3.50

ESSAYS IN SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

Revised Edition
By Talcott Parsons
February, \$6.00

PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

By Emile Durkheim
January, \$3.00

CONFLICT

By George Simmel
April, \$3.50

SYMBOLIC WOUNDS: Initiation Rites and the Envious Male

By Bruno Bettelheim
January, \$5.00

INDIVIDUALISM RECONSIDERED

By David Riesman
April, \$6.00

GUESSES AT THE RIDDLE

By Ernest Nagel
April, \$5.00

METHODS IN PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

By George Stern, Benjamin Bloom and Morris Stein
May, \$6.00

PERSONAL INFLUENCE: The Decatur Study

By Paul F. Lazarsfeld and others

In addition ten other titles are planned for publication between May and August of 1954. These titles will be announced in subsequent issues of this journal. Orders for titles not published will be held and shipped when ready. Fuller particulars concerning each separate title will be sent on request. We would appreciate your passing on this notice to your students and school librarian.

THE FREE PRESS GLENCOE, ILLINOIS

When writing advertisers please mention SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

stitute
k the
which
rature

GY

on

ERED

y

he

ers

ay and
of this
when
ent on
udents

